

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 3.

WHOLE No. 127.

I.—THE HOUSE-DOOR IN GREEK AND ROMAN RELIGION AND FOLK-LORE.

The important part which the threshold and the house-door play in the folk-lore and religion of various peoples¹ led me to inquire whether they were of equal importance among the Greeks and Romans. I have collected, therefore, what is, I trust, a fairly complete list of references in Greek and Latin literature to superstitions connected with the threshold and the door. The references show that the most prominent belief in connection with them was that spirits haunted their vicinity. A theory, then, which will logically account for the presence of these spirits should furnish a simple and sufficient explanation for the important character of the door-way in religion and folklore.

One of the most common² superstitions connected with the threshold is that to stumble thereon betokens bad luck. This belief was current among the Romans and, I believe, among the Greeks also, although the evidence in the case of the latter is scanty. There is recorded a saying of Pythagoras³ that "If you

¹ Cf. especially Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, and the references cited below.

² For this superstition among other peoples, cf. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 sq.; Brand, *Pop. Antiq. Index*, s. v. *Stumbling*; Aubrey, *Remaines of Gentil. and Judaisme*, ed. Britten, Lond., 1881, p. 56; Winternitz, *Denkschr. Wien. Akad. d. Wiss.* XL, 1892, p. 71; Haltrich, *Volkskund. d. Siebenburg. Sachsen*, p. 316; Wuttke, *Deutsch. Volksab.*, pp. 396; 471; Conder, *Heth and Moab*, pp. 293-4; Marco Polo, *Bk. II*, ch. 13, with Yule's note, vol. 1, pp. 341 sq.

³ Mullach, *Fr. Gr. Phil.* 2, p. 510; cf. Frazer, *Folk-Lore Jour.* (London), I, p. 156. These words of Pythagoras do not necessarily prove that this superstition was Greek; it may have been Italic.

stumble upon the threshold on going out, you should turn back"; and Plut. refers to the same belief in the life of Demetrius as well as in the lives of the Romans, Ti. Gracchus and Crassus:

Demetr. 29, 2: Ἀντίγονος δὲ . . . ἐξὶν προσέπταισεν ὥστε πεσεῖν . . . ἀναστὰς δὲ . . . ἠτήσατο νίκην παρὰ τῶν θεῶν.

Tiber. Gracch. 17, 3: πρὶν ἐξελθεῖν προσέπταισε πρὸς τὸν οὐδὸν σφοδρὰς οὕτω πληγῆς γενομένης ὥστε τὸν μὲν ὄνυχᾶ . . . ῥαγῆναι.

Cras. 17, 6: ἐξιόντων γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πρῶτος ἐσφάλῃ κατὰ τὰς πύλας ὁ νεανίας Κράσσος, εἴτ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ περιπεσὼν ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

In Roman literature we find the following references to this omen:

Cic. de div. 2, 40, 84: quae si suscipiamus, pedis offensio nobis et abruptio corrigiae et sternumenta erunt observanda. And so Pl. N. H. 2, 24 puts "offensiones pedum"¹ among omens.

Tibull. 1, 3, 19: quotiens ingressus iter mihi tristia dixi/offensum in porta signa dedisse pedem.

Id. 1, 7, 62: te canit agricola e magna cum venerit urbe/serus inoffensum rettuleritque pedem.

Ov. Am. 1, 12, 3: omina sunt aliquid. Modo cum discedere vellet/ad limen digitos restitit icta Nape.

Id. Her. 13, 85: cum foribus velles ad Troiam exire paternis/pes tuus offenso limine signa dedit.

Id. Trist. 3, 4, 33: nam pede inoffenso spatium decurrere vitae/dignus es et fato candidiore frui.

Id. M. 10, 452: ter pedis offensi signo est revocata, ter omen/funereus bubo letali carmine fecit; cf. Trist. 1, 3, 55.

Verg. Aen. 2, 242 seems to have had the same idea in mind when he says of the wooden horse: quater ipso in limine portae/substitit atque utero sonitum quater arma dedere.

Valer. Max. 1, 4, 2: Ti. Gracchus . . . auspicia . . . petiit, quae illi perquam tristia responderunt: et ianua egressus ita pedem offendit ut digitus ei decuteretur. This incident is also referred to by Plut. Ti. Gr. 17, 3 (cf. above), and Jul. Obs. 86.

Petron. 132: podagrici pedibus suis maledicunt, chiragrici manibus, lippi oculis et qui offenderunt saepe digitos, quidquid doloris habent, in pedes deferunt. There are also two other

¹Stumbling elsewhere than on the threshold seems to have been a bad omen; cf. Eurip. Heracl. 730; Valer. Max. 1, 5, 2, of Camillus: subito lapsus decidit, quod omen ad damnationem qua postea oppressus est; ib. 1, 6, 6; Suet. Caes. 59; August. de doctr. christ. 2, 20, 31.

passages which may refer to this belief, but their fragmentary condition renders a definite decision impossible:

Novius, Macc. Ex. fr. 2 (Ribb. 2, p. 262): *limen superum quod mei misero saepe confregit caput/inferum autem digitos omnis ubi ego defregi meos.*

Petron. 138: *evasi tamen omnibus digitis inter praecipitem decursum cruentatis.*

To prevent the bride from stumbling on the threshold and thus to avoid the bad omen is one of the reasons given by the ancients to explain the Roman¹ custom of lifting her over the threshold of her husband's house. This custom is referred to by the following writers:

Plaut. Cas. 815: *super attolle limen pedes mea nova nupta: sospes iter incipe hoc ut viro tuo semper sis superstes.*

Varro ap. Serv. Verg. Ecl. 8, 29: (sponsas) *ideo limen ait non tangere ne a sacrilegio inchoarent si depositurae virginitatem calcent rem Vestae, i. e. numini castissimo consecratam.* For the latter statement, cf. Myth. Vat. 3, 12, 2; Serv. Aen. 2, 467; 6, 273.

Catull. 61, 166: *transfer omine cum bono/limen aureolos pedes.*

Luc. Phar. 2, 359: *turritaque premens frontem matrona corona/tralata vetuit contingere limina planta.*

Isid. Or. 9, 7, 12: *uxores dictae quasi unxiores: quae ideo vetebantur limina calcare quod illic ianuae et coeant et separerentur* (cf. Ellis' note on Catull., l. l.).

Plut. Rom. Quaes. 29: *διὰ τί τὴν γαμουμένην οὐκ ἔωσιν αὐτὴν ὑπερβῆναι τὸν οὐδὸν τῆς οἰκίας, ἀλλ' ὑπεραίρουσιν οἱ προπέμποντες;*

Id. Romul. 15, 5: *διαμένει δὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ τὴν νύμφην αὐτὴν ἀφ' αὐτῆς μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν τὸν οὐδὸν εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον.*

Modern authorities² are inclined to adopt this explanation of the ancients and surely the analogous practices of other peoples would seem to point to the avoidance of the bad omen of stumb-

¹ So among the ancient Hindoos a bride was forbidden to stand on the threshold; cf. Grihya Sutras, Sacr. Bks. of the East, XXX, pp. 193, 263; and lifting the bride is common in many parts of the world; cf. Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 36 sq.

² Adopted by Bekker Gall.³ 2, pp. 26, 46; Crooke, The Lifting of the Bride, F-L Jour. 13, 1902, pp. 238 sq.; Prel.-Jord. R. M. 2, 217; Winternitz, l. l.; Eitrem, Hermes u. die Toten, p. 14. The other view suggested by Plut., l. l., that the custom was a survival typifying the capture of the bride is defended by Rossbach, Röm. Ehe, p. 359; but cf. Marq.-Momm. Privatl., p. 55, n. 11.

ling as the main motive; we are safe, at least, in concluding that upon the threshold¹ lurked some danger to the bride, danger which she could escape by not treading thereon.²

What, then, is the explanation of this dangerous character of the threshold, emphasized as it is by the bad omen of stumbling upon it as well as by the necessity of lifting the bride over it? In the case of other peoples the explanation is clearly to be found in the idea that spirits haunted the vicinity of the house-door; and if it can be shown that this idea was current among the Greeks and Romans also, the same explanation surely will suffice. That it was, is seen from the fact that beneath the threshold, or on the door, were placed prophylactic substances to protect the house from evil spirits, and that the threshold, or the vicinity of the door, was the place for performing all sorts of magic rites, which are, in the last analysis, generally concerned with the spirits of the dead.

We read in Pl. N. H. 29, 67: *draconis caput limini ianuarum subditum propitiatis dis*³ *fortunatam domum facere promittitur*; and again, 30, 82: *contra omnia mala medicamenta, item sanguinem canis respersis parietibus genitaleque eius sub limine ianuae defossum*. Likewise in Geop. 15, 8, 1, *μελισσῶν σμήνη μὴ φαρμακοῦσθαι*, Leontinus recommends that the right hoof of a black ass be buried under the threshold of the hive, and sprinkled over with pine-resin, salt, cumin, sea-onion, and among other things, the

¹ In modern Greece, the bride is lifted over the threshold to keep from stumbling upon it, which is considered bad luck; Wachsmuth, *Das alte Gr. im neuen*, p. 97. Among the Manchus the bride is carried into the groom's house in a sedan chair, after crackers have been fired before the door to drive away spirits; F-L Jour. 1, p. 487. In the Punjab, small bundles of cotton are laid upon the threshold, on which the bride steps as she crosses it, *ib.* 9 (1898), p. 153; among the western Somali tribes a sacrifice of a goat or a sheep is made on the threshold, and the bride steps over it as she enters; a similar custom is recorded of the Bedouins; cf. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins*, p. 151; cf. also F-L Jour. 1, p. 459. Other examples in Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 sq.

² Whether this idea gave rise to the custom of crossing the threshold with the right foot (Petron. 30), is doubtful; the right foot was the proper one to start with not only when about to enter a house or temple (cf. Verg. A. 8, 302; Iambl. V. Py. 28, 156), but when beginning a journey (cf. Juv. 10, 5; Apul. M. 1, 5; Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 37), and even, according to Pythagoras (Iambl. V. Py. 18), when putting on shoes.

³ By "dis" we are to understand chthonic powers, if Pliny did not; cf. *ib.* 25, 50 with 25, 109 and Theophr. h. pl. 9, 8, 7.

πανσπερμία. Colum. 7, 5, 17 advises that when a flock of sheep is suffering from disease, one of them should be buried alive in a ditch dug on the threshold, and the rest of the flock driven over it. In a fragment of Aristoph. Dan. 255 K, a sea-onion is buried under the threshold, and according to Pl. N. H. 20, 101, Pythagoras recommended the same means for preventing "*malorum medicamentorum introitum*";¹ Dios. 2, 202 describes this plant as *ἀλεξιφάρμακον ὅλη πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν κρεμαμένη*, cf. Geop. 15, 1, 31: *πάντα φθόνον καὶ ἐπιβουλὴν ἐλαύνει . . ἡ σκίλλα ξηρανομένη, καὶ ἐν τῷ προθύρῳ τῆς οἰκίας κειμένη*. During the Greek Anthesteria, when the spirits of the dead were about,² and at the time of child-birth, when also danger was feared from them,³ the Athenian anointed his doors with pitch and chewed buckthorn,⁴—a plant which was also hung before house-doors "to repel the evil arts of the magicians", Dios. 1, 119, and as an aid against *φάρμακα καὶ φαντάσματα*, Schol. Nicand. Ther. 860. The same ideas led the Roman to strike his door-posts and threshold thrice with branches of the arbuté-tree in order to keep out "striges" (Ov. F. 6, 155); and to hang a frog on the door of the granary for the protection of the grain (Pl. 18, 303). Pliny, 29, 83, also tells us that a bat serves as an amulet if hung by its feet to the lintel of the sheep-fold; and again (32, 44), that the "*stella marina*", if smeared with the blood of a fox and fastened by an iron nail to the lintel of the door, prevents the entry of "*mala medicamenta*". For a similar reason,—"*ne quid mali medicamenti inferretur*"—it was the custom for newly-wedded brides to anoint the door-posts with wolf's fat (Pl. 28, 142; cf. ib. 28, 135). Pliny likewise states, in writing of the virtues of iron (34, 151), that nails⁵ torn from graves and fastened to the threshold have power against "*nocturnae lymphationes*"; and (28, 85), that the tricks of the Magi are brought to naught "*tactis—menstruo⁶ postibus*"; the

¹ Similarly in Szekely lore, cows are thought to be protected against witchcraft by placing garlic over the door or into a hole in the threshold; cf. F-L Jour. 21, 1884, p. 104; also pp. 330-331. ² Cf. Rohde, Psy. 1, p. 237.

³ Cf. Pl. N. H. 28, 247 sq.; August. de civ. dei 6, 9.

⁴ Cf. Phot. s. v. *Μιαρὰ ἡμέρα* and *ράμνος*; Rohde, l. l., n. 3; Harrison, Prol., p. 39; Samter, Familienf., p. 113; Eitrem, op. cit., p. 22.

⁵ For nails in magic, cf. Pl. 26, 24; 28, 46; Pallad. 4, 10, 4. The fact that these were taken from a grave added to their power; cf. Pl. 28, 140; 226; Apul. M. 3, 17; cf. Theocr. 5, 121; Ov. Her. 6, 89; Prop. 4, 5, 29.

⁶ For this as prophylactic, cf. Pl. 28, 77 sq.; Frazer, Golden Bough 1, 170; 2, 225 sq.

same end was also gained,—28, 104,—by affixing a mixture of barley and blood to the posts. In order to turn all men's hatred against an enemy, says Pl. 28, 117, the intestines of a chameleon should be mixed with monkey's urine and affixed to his door. The same authority also tells us,—28, 86,—that if a person, who is suffering from fever, fastens the clippings from his finger and toe nails to another's door, the ailment will be transferred to him. On the door, too, were written magic verses to keep out weasels (Geop. 13, 15, 8), the word *'Αδάμ* to keep serpents away (Geop. 13, 8, 4; 14, 5), and the words "arse verse"¹ to protect the house from fire. So the ill-omened birds that fly in the night were hung on the door to protect the house from lightning (Colum. de cult. hort. 346; Pallad. 1, 35, 1), or as Apul. (M. 3, 23) puts it: "ut quod infaustis volatibus familiae minantur exitium, suis luant cruciatibus". In like manner, when a hail-storm threatened, a crocodile's skin was hung up at the entrance of the house (Pallad. 1, 35, 14; Geop. 1, 14, 5).² And the same ideas prompted the inhabitants of the early cities of Greece and Italy to sculpture phalli on the lintel of the city gates.³ The custom, too, of having the threshold of bronze⁴ may have been due to the belief in the prophylactic properties of this metal.⁵

In the case of many of these practices it may be objected that the prophylactic substance was hung before the door because through the door the powers of ill would enter no matter whence they came; thus in Ovid F. 6, 165 *spina alba* is placed in the window to keep out the striges, after the door-posts and the threshold have been struck thrice with branches of the arbute

¹ Cf. Otto, Sprichw. n. 172; Riess, Art. Aberglaube, Pauly-Wiss. 1.

² This custom of placing prophylactic substances under the threshold or on the door is common among all peoples, and numerous examples are cited by Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 14 sq. Among the Magyars a love charm consists in burying "three beans and three bulbs of garlic and a few pieces of dried coal and a dead frog" under the threshold, Jones and Kropfs, Folk-Tales of the Magyars, p. 332; cf. Turner, Samoa, pp. 21, 56 sq.; Jour. Am. F-L. 12, 126. In ancient Assyria amulets with curses and charms upon them were buried beneath the threshold, Maspero, Life in Anc. Egypt and Assyria, pp. 195, 219.

³ Cf. Dennis, Cit. and Cem. of Etrur. 2, 109.

⁴ Paus. 9, 19, 7; cf. Hom. Od. 7, 83 sq.; cf. the threshold of the various entrances to Hades, at Kolonos, e. g., Soph. O. C. 56 sq. and Gruppe, G. M. 895, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. Arch. f. Religionsw. 10, 1907, p. 41.

tree, and the door-way has been sprinkled with water,—methods, clearly, of riddance. In the following examples, however, there is no question of the spirits entering the house, but only of the necessity for their presence that the magic rite may be effective. In the love charm in Theocr. 2, 59 sq. the magic herbs are smeared on the threshold, and in the corresponding passage in Vergil's 8th Ecl. vs. 93, the garments left behind by the fickle Daphnis, "dear pledges of himself", are buried under the threshold. According to Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 281, 22 (Rose), *canis numquam rabiet in domo, si pellem canis rabiosi sub limen oblige vel in porta figas*. With these passages may be compared Pap. Mag. Mus. Lugd. Bat. J. 384, III, 1 (Dieterich, p. 799): *Ἐργαστήριον εὖ πράσσειν. ἐπὶ φῶς ὀρνίθος ἀρσενικοῦ ἐπίγραφει καὶ κατόρυξον πρὸς τὸν οὐδὸν . . . ἦδε εὐχὴ τοῦ φῶς ὁ μέγας θεός, δός μοι χάριν, πράξιν καὶ τόπῳ τούτῳ, ὅπου κεῖται τὸ φῶς, ἐν ᾧ οἶκῳ πραγματεύομαι*. Hence the threshold plays a very prominent part in medicinal lore. We read in Marc. Emp. 2, 4: *emicranium statim curant vermes terreni*¹ *pari numero sinistra manu lecti et in limine cum terra de limine eadem manu triti et cum aceto optimo eadem manu fronti vel temporibus inliti*. In other cases the patient must be standing on or near the threshold² when he takes the magic remedy, as in Marc. Emp. 14, 66: *picem mollem cerebro eius inpone, qui uvam dolebit, praecipe ut super limen stans superiori limini ipsam picem capite suo adfigat*; ib. 16, 21: *ieiunus*—*per dies continuos novem in limine stans bibe*; ib. 23, 35, for disorders of the spleen, a person is to drink *ebuli radicem, quam sine ferro evellas, in limine stans contra orientem per triduum ieiunus*, cf. Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 324, 5. Similarly in 4, 27, a person who is to take a concoction used to cure porrigo, *supra limen adsistat idque triduo faciat*. Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 345, 14: *ut cito pariat mulier, scribes in limine superiore ostii Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit*; ib. 323, 27: *lacertam viridem in vase fictili novo mittes, et per medium limen pendeat, ubi spleniticus manet, et condes. Dum exit sive ingreditur, idem vas tangat mox ab eo morbo libera-*

¹ Earth-worms were commonly used as a remedy, cf. Marc. Emp. 9, 64; 84; 108; 14, 23 sq.

² So in Tuscany at the present time, folk remedies are taken on the threshold; cf. Leland, *Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition*, pp. 282, 321.

bitur.¹ The hinge, also, and other parts of the door were used in similar practices. Marc. Emp. 1, 65: *glebular de limine vel ipso cardine erasas cum aceto simul permisce eoque luto frontem inline, quo caput confestim gravissimo dolore relevabis.* So Pl. 28, 49, recommends the dirt from the door-hinges for headache. Marc. Emp. 28, 37: *ad ventris dolorem remedium efficax sic: sordes de cardine ostii tolle digitis duobus, pollice et medicinali, et super umbilicum laborantis adpone.* Ib. 17, 48, *ad reumaticos: sordium aut pulveris . . . in foramine, in quo ianuae pessuli descendunt, quidquid reppereris collige . . . et tacite vel occulto loco in potionem aut cibum . . . insperge.* The key also was prophylactic; cf. Geop. 1, 14, 6: *εἰ δὲ καὶ κλειδιά πολλά διαφόρων οἰκημάτων κύκλῳ τοῦ χωρίου ἐν σχοινίοις ἀπαρτήσεις, παρελεύσεται ἡ χάλασα.* And through the key-hole² Hermes makes his way in Hom. Hy. 3, 146. The presence of spirits around the door-way is distinctly implied, moreover, in a practice described by Ps.-Apul. de virt. herb. 7: *si quis devotatus defixusque fuerit in suis nuptiis sic eum resolves; herbae pedis leonis frutices numero septem sine radicibus decoque cum aqua, luna decrescente, lavato eum, et te ipsum qui facis, ante limen extra domum prima nocte, et herbam incende aristolochiam et suffumigato eum et redito ad domum et ne post vos respiciatis, resolvisti eum.* The warning "Look not behind you" is an invariable sign³ of the presence of spirits, for it was dangerous even to catch sight of them. Similar evidence is furnished by a passage in Pl. 20, 6, where he writes: *putant . . . adiuvari . . . partus . . . si in arietis lana adligatum (elaterium)*

¹ Although many of these practices seem to rest upon the common folk belief that diseases can be transferred to objects which are brought into contact with the patient, this idea alone will not explain why the threshold should be chosen as the place where the object should be buried, or where the magic rite should be performed. The Law of Sympathy requires simply that such an object should be buried, so that, as it decays, sickness may cease. Nor can we say that in the practice quoted from the *Additamenta* the vase was suspended from the lintel because the patient would touch it, on this account, most frequently; cf. the English custom of driving a nail in the lintel to cure toothache, *F-L Jour.* 6, 1895, p. 158.

² Cf. Hom. Od. 4, 802 where the *εἰδῶλον ἐς θάλαμον δ' εἰσῆλθε παρὰ κληίδος ἱμάντα*. Cf. Gruppe, *G. M.* 1295, n. 3; Eitrem, *op. cit.*, 37-8. He compares the German saying (Wuttke², *D. V.*, § 297; § 753): "Wenn ein Schlüssel aus dem Thürschloss fällt, sterbe jemand im Hause".

³ Cf. Theocr. 24, 94; Ap. Rh. 3, 1039; Ov. F. 5, 443 sq.; Pl. 29, 91; Eustath. ad Hom. Od. 22, 481, p. 1934-5; Rohde, *Psy.* 2, 85.

inscientis lumbis fuerit, ita ut protinus ab enixu rapiatur extra domum. The last words can only mean that the remedy was thought of as a purificatory substance which, as often, was thrown out as an offering to the spirits of the dead.¹ This may explain why in Philostr. vit. Ap. 3, 39, 2, a hare which was used at the same critical moment had to be carried quickly without the door.² St. August. de civ. dei 6, 9, quoting Varro, has preserved for us another interesting practice in connection with child-birth: mulieri fetae post partum tres deos commemorat adhiberi, ne Silvanus deus per noctem ingrediatur et vexet, eorumque custodum significandorum causa tres homines noctu circumire limina domus et primo limen securi ferire, postea pilo, tertio deverrere scopis. With this use of the broom we may compare the custom of sweeping out a house after a corpse had been removed;³ the mortar,⁴ and doubtless the pestle, also, and the axe⁵ were both prophylactic and occur in other folk practices. There are, further, two passages in Ovid which clearly illustrate this idea that spirits haunted the vicinity of the threshold; in Met. 7, 235 sq., when Medea is making her preparations to rejuvenate Aeson, constitit adveniēns citra limenque foresque, / et tantum caelo tegitur: . . . statuitque aras e caespite binas / dexteriore Hecates, ast laeva parte Iuventae. / . . . haud procul egesta scrobibus tellure duabus / sacra facit, cultrosque in guttura velleris⁶ atri / conicit, et patulas perfundit sanguine fossas.⁶ In Met. 9, 295 sq., when Alcmena narrates her sufferings at the birth of Hercules, she tells how Juno subsedit in illa / ante fores ara, dextroque a poplite laevum / pressa genu et digitis inter se pectine iunctis / sustinuit partus. tacita quoque carmina voce / dixit, et incoeptos tenuerunt carmina partus.⁷ We may also note

¹ Cf. Rohde, Psy. 2, 79, and n. 1.

² The reason given is: *ἐνεκδοθήναι ἂν τῷ ἐμβρύῳ τὴν μήτραν.*

³ Cf. Paul. ex Fest., p. 77; Prel.-Jord. R. M. 1, 377; 2, 93.

⁴ For the mortar, cf. Cato de agr. cult. 127; an interesting parallel among the people of the island of Thanet, cf. F-L Jour. 5, 1894, p. 23. For the axe, cf. Pallad. 1, 35, 1; it was also used in divination, *ἀξινόμαντρεῖα*; Pl. 30, 14; cf. the *ὄλμος*, Aristoph. Vesp. 201, 238 and Schol.; Zenob. 3, 63.

⁵ For the ram as spirit offering, cf. Dion. Hal. A. R. 4, 22; Frazer on Paus. 5, 13, 2; 9, 39, 6.

⁶ Offerings to the dead were commonly made in a ditch; cf. Hom. Od. 11, 24 sq.; Stat. Theb. 4, 559; 11, 63; cf. below.

⁷ For this belief, cf. Pl. 28, 59; and 28, 42.

Ovid's statement, *Met.* 11, 605, concerning the palace of Somnus: *ante fores antri secunda papavera florent/innumeraeque herbae, quarum de lacte soporem/Nox legit et spargit per opacas umida terras.* One of the charges which Apuleius refutes in his *Apology* (58), is that in the vestibule of a house rented by a friend of his, whom he often visited, were found quantities of bird feathers, and the walls were blackened by smoke,—facts which his accusers asserted were evidence of his "nocturna sacra". It may be noted, too, that just as the threshold was the proper seat in Hades of the Furies,¹ so when they visited the living, they took their seat upon the threshold; the *Dirae* in *Verg. Aen.* 4, 473; *Allecto* in *Aen.* 7, 343; *Tisiphone* in *Ov. Met.* 4, 485; cf. *Stat. Theb.* 5, 69. When there was danger of pollution, too, the threshold was washed with water, as in *Ov. Fast.* 6, 155 sq., when the house is purified after the entrance of the "striges". And *Prop.* 4, 8, 84, represents *Cynthia* as washing the threshold with pure water after the visit upon him of the two "ladies of easy virtue". It was "in *limine sacro*" also, that the inhabitants of *Egnatia* tried to persuade *Horace* and his companions (*S.* 1, 5, 99), that incense would burn without fire.² It is important to note, also, that it was "ad *limina*" that the *Penates* appeared to *Aeneas* when they, bearing *Apollo's* message, bade him leave *Crete* for the West (*Verg. A.* 3, 155). Similarly *Helenus* stands "ad *limina*" when he makes his prophecy to *Aeneas* (*ib.* 3, 371); and the *Sibyl* is before the threshold of her cave when she receives the divine inspiration (*ib.* 6, 45; cf. 115; 151). *Ovid, F.* 3, 358, also tells us that *Numa* and his people took their stand "ante *limina regis*" when at sunrise³ they were awaiting omens from *Jupiter*. Perhaps these passages may serve to explain *Hom. Od.* 8, 80: *ὅς γάρ οἱ <Ἀγαμέμνονι> χρείων μύθησατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων/Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ ὅθ' ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδὸν/χρησόμενος.* The expression can hardly mean simply, "he entered the temple".

¹ Cf. *Verg. Aen.* 6, 555; *Ov. Met.* 4, 453 sq.; cf. *Gruppe, G. M.* 405.

² Cf. *Pl.* 2, 240, who, however, says nothing of a threshold. For attempts at explanation, cf. *Macleane's* note. The point here is that the "sacrum limen" was chosen as the spot to perform the miracle.

³ The early morning was the favorite time for the performance of magic rites; cf. *Pl.* 29, 85, 91; *Riess, Pauly-Wiss.* 1, 38 sq. In Sicily it is still the custom to go out before the house-door on the first Monday of the month to take auguries; cf. *Pitré, Tradiz. Sicil.* 17, p. 253.

These citations would seem to indicate that the threshold was thought to be the source of prophetic inspiration, and we may compare the familiar grave-oracles (Rohde, *Psy.* 1, 186 sq.), and the belief that the spirits of the dead foretold the future (cf. Herod. 4, 149; 5, 92, 7; Plat. *Leg.* 10, 909 B; Verg. *A.* 10, 33; Diog. Laert. 8, 1, 32; August. *de civ. dei* 7, 35). It is, moreover, only by reference to this belief in the presence of spirits round the door-way, that we can explain the Roman custom of laying the dying before the door (Serv. ad *Aen.* 12, 395). Ut extremum spiritum redderent terrae is Servius' explanation, but they were laid before the door and not elsewhere,¹ as is the custom among other peoples, because here was the haunt of spirits, especially, as I shall try to point out below, of the family spirits.

To be mentioned here is the custom referred to by Hesych. s. v. ὠπωτήρη: διὰ φαρμάκων εἰώθασί τινες ἐπάγειν τὴν Ἑκάτην ταῖς οἰκίαις, πῦρ πρὸ θυρῶν, with which may be compared id. s. v. ὠπι ἄνασσα, πυρρὰ πρόθυρος πῦρ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν. Bergk, *PLG* 3, p. 682, by supposing that these passages really belong together, thinks that they refer to a custom described by Theodoret. 1, 352, ed. Sirmond, according to whom it was a yearly practice in some cities to light fires in the streets through which men and boys leaped, and even small children were carried for the purposes of purification. This makes the rite comparable to the fire ceremonies which are common in various parts of the world.² This may be correct, but it is sufficient for my purpose to take the statements of Hesychius as they stand: that at times fires were built before the house-doors and Hecate invoked,³ proof enough that we are dealing with spirits.⁴ If Opis = Artemis,—and of their close relationship there can be no doubt,⁵—and if Opis, as Hesychius implies, was, like Hecate, concerned in the above rite, the fact furnishes further evidence of the connection of

¹ Cf. Mau, *Pauly-Wiss.* 3, 347. Remarking that Serv. explanation is correct, he adds: "nur dass deshalb der Sterbende nicht gerade vor die Thür gelegt zu werden brauchte". Parallel practices in Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*, pp. 26 sq.

² Cf. Gruppe, *Gr. M.* 892, n. 4.

³ In Lucian, *Necyom.* 9, the Magus holds a burning torch when he invokes Hecate. Torches hung on door at wedding, Bion 1, 88.

⁴ For Hecate in connection with magic, cf. Steuding, *Roscher's Lex.* 1, 1894.

⁵ Cf. Crusius, *R. Lex.* 1, 2811 sq.; Höfer, *ib.* 3, 927 sq.

Hecate and Artemis with each other and with the house-door.¹ Their statues were set up in front of it² and both bore the name Prothyraia.³ We may suppose, too, that before these statues of Hecate, as before those on the cross-roads, were cast the remains, as offerings, of substances which had been used in purificatory ceremonies.⁴ Similarly statues of Hermes were set up on the cross-roads and before doors, which as Hermes Strophaios or Thyraios,⁵ he protected and from which he kept out ill.⁶ The same is true also of the conical pillars of Apollo Agyieus, and this god likewise bore the name Thyraios.⁷ In Rome, also, the threshold had its protecting deities, Janus, Forculus, Limentinus, Cardea, and others.⁸ The Lares afford even a closer parallel to these Greek gods, for their statues were likewise set up on the cross-roads⁹ and, although in the family cult, they were commonly placed within the house near the hearth, we have plenty of evidence to show that they were also placed at the entrance to the house.¹⁰

These facts are sufficient surely to warrant the conclusion that round the threshold spirits were thought to gather,—a belief to which the superstitions of many peoples furnish striking analogies.¹¹ They point, moreover, to an evident connection between

¹ Cf. Roscher's Lex. 1, 571 sq.; 781 sq.; Gruppe, Gr. M. 1289, n. 2.

² Cf. Aristoph. Vesp. 804; Aeschyl. fr. 378 N; Gruppe, Gr. M. 1289, n. 2.

³ Cf. Hesych. s. v. ἐκάτα; Orph. hy. 2, 12; Gruppe 1296, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. Phot. s. v. ὀφειόμενα; Rohde, Psy. 2, 79, n. 1; Steuding, l. l., 1889; cf. above, p. 258. Suggestive is Stat. Theb. 9, 818: cultus Triviae pendebitis alto/limine, captivis matrem donabo pharetris.

⁵ Cf. R. Lex. 1, 2382; Gruppe, 1337, n. 6; Usener, Rh. M. 29 (1874), p. 27; 58 (1903), 163 sq.; Eitrem, Hermes u. d. Toten, 1 sq.

⁶ Aristot. Oec. 1, 6, p. 1345; Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 1153; Hermes and Hecate seem also to have been connected in the house cult; cf. Lobeck, Aglaoph. 1007, n; 1335 sq.; Eitrem, p. 9; and Hermes, as H. Chthonius, like Hecate, associated with the spirits of the dead; cf. Rohde, Psy. 1, p. 238; Eitrem, pp. 41 sq.

⁷ Aristoph. Eq. 1320; Frazer on Paus. 1, 31, 6.

⁸ Tert. de Idol. 15; Prel.-Jord. 2, 217.

⁹ Cf. Wissowa, R. Lex. 2, 1872 sq.; De Marchi, Il Culto Priv. d. Roma Ant. 1, pp. 29 sq.

¹⁰ Cf. Ov. F. 1, 136; Hieronym. in Esaiam 6, 57; Marq.-Momm. Staatsv. 3, 126, n. 1; Privatl. 240. Similar evidence from the houses at Pompeii, cf. De Marchi, pp. 80 sq.

¹¹ The ancient Hindoos believed that spirits haunted the threshold; cf. Oldenberg, Rel. d. Veda 561; so the Germans, Wuttke, D. Volksab., p. 89;

the threshold and the cross-roads, which are also the common haunt of spirits, not only in Greek and Latin lore, but in that of widely scattered peoples.¹ This connection is to be inferred from the Hecate-cult² and that of the Lares, at whose festival, the Compitalia, figures of wool were hung both on the house-doors and the cross-roads;³ on the cross-roads, too, as on the threshold and near the door, were performed all sorts of magic rites.⁴

Many of the practices connected with the house-door seem to point to a cult which was originally no doubt directed to the spirits that were always near by. A Roman bride had to bind the door-posts of her husband's house with wool and smear them with fat or oil.⁵ The woolen figures, which were hung before doors on the Compitalia evidently originated as a substitute for human sacrifice to these spirits "ut vivis parcerent et essent his pilis et simulacris contenti" (Fest. ep., p. 239, 1). So in Greece, at the time of childbirth, wool or olive branches were hung on the doors,⁶ and at the Ephebia, laurel was hung there.⁷ This custom was also usual at Roman weddings and at other times,⁸ and cypress branches were hung before the door when a corpse lay within.⁹ It was both a Greek and Roman custom to lay

in Russia the Domovoi, or "house-spirit", has his seat there; cf. Spectator (London), June 18, 1892; the house fairies, according to Irish belief; Crooke, F-L of No. India, 1, 241; cf. p. 203. So the Hebrew Elohim, Riess, A. J. P. 18, p. 191.

¹ Cf. Oldenberg, op. cit., 267 sq.; Wuttke, op. cit., p. 89; Samter, op. cit., pp. 120 sq.; Pradel, Griech. Gebete, 96.

² Cf. above, and Rohde, Psy. 2, 79, n. 1; Gruppe, G. M., p. 1291, n. 1.

³ Cf. Fest. ep., p. 121, 17; Macr. S. 1, 7, 34; Prel.-Jord. 2, 111; Samter, op. cit., pp. 111 sq.

⁴ Their important place in the cult of Hecate is sufficient proof of this; cf. Theophr. Ch. 16; Hor. S. 2, 3, 281; Tibul. 1, 3, 11 sq.; 1, 5, 56; cf. Eitrem, op. cit., 40. For similar practices among the ancient Hindoos, cf. Gob. Grih. Sut. 2, 1, 4 (SBE 30, p. 42); ib. 2, 4, 2 (SBE, p. 49); Bloomfield, A. Veda, p. 519.

⁵ Pl. 29, 30; 28, 135; 142; Luc. Phar. 2, 355; Serv. Aen. 4, 458; Prel.-Jord. 2, 217; Samter, 80 sq.

⁶ Hesych. s. v. στέφανον ἐκφέρειν.

⁷ Cf. E. M. 531, 54; Samter, pp. 86 sq.

⁸ Cf. Juv. 6, 79 c. Schol.; Luc. Phar. 2, 354; Sen. Thyest. 54; Tert. ad uxorem. 2, 6; cf. the use of laurel on tomb-stones, C. I. L. 6, 10328; cf. A. J. P. 31 (1910), 293 sq.

⁹ Serv. Aen. 3, 64; 681; 4, 507; cf. Prel.-Jord. 2, 93; Rohde, Psy. 1, 220, n. 1.

sacrificial gifts upon the threshold or hang them on the doors,¹—evidently as an altar. As an altar, too, Aeneas (Verg. Aen. 6, 636), when he had purified himself with water before entering the Elysian Fields, fastened the Golden Bough on the threshold in front of him. As an altar, too, the threshold served as a place of refuge for the suppliant and distressed;² cf. Valer. Max. 2, 10, 2: *qui postes ianuae tamquam religiosissimam aram sanctumque templum venerati*. And one of the precepts of Pythagoras was that the doors should be kissed fondly by those who enter or depart,³ and Porphyry. de ant. nym. 27 remarks of his followers: *οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ οἱ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις σοφοὶ μὴ λαλεῖν ἀπηγόρευον διερχομένους ἢ πύλας ἢ θύραν*. In Tibull. 1, 2, 84, part of the lover's penance is: "dare sacratis oscula liminibus" of Venus' temple; so in 1, 3, 29 sq. Delia is to sit, clad in linen, when paying her vows, before the sacred doors of the temple of Isis; cf. Stat. Theb. 9, 606 of Atalanta at the shrine of Diana: "*limine divae/astitit et . . . precatur*"; cf. ib. 6, 636; Petron. 133, 3. This sacredness is emphasized also by the fact, recorded in a fragment of Menander, Inc. 740 K. that people swore "by the doors":⁴ *μαρτύρομαι, ναὶ μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τουτονὶ/καὶ τὰς θύρας*.

Several theories⁵ have been advanced to explain the general belief in the sacredness of the threshold, and to account for the

¹ Herod. 1, 90; Verg. Aen. 10, 620; 4, 202; Prop. 4, 3, 17; Tibull. 1, 1, 15; Stat. Theb. 10, 344; Apul. M. 6, 3; for this custom among other peoples, cf. Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 120 sq.

² Cf. Hom. Il. 9, 581 sq.; Ap. Rh. 4, 26; Verg. Aen. 2, 490; 673; 3, 351; 11, 483; Ov. M. 1, 376; 13, 412; Livy 45, 44, 20; Sen. Phaedr. 860; Valer Fl. 1, 676; Juv. 6, 47; Stat. Theb. 3, 688.

³ Mullach, Fr. Ph. Gr. 1, p. 510; cf. Herod. 2, 121 of a similar Egyptian custom; and for parallels elsewhere, Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 12, 31, 116, 123, 130.

⁴ Cited by Riess, A. J. P. 18, 191.

⁵ According to Trumbull, pp. 1, 98, the primitive altar of the family was on the threshold, and "when first a twain were made one in a covenant of blood the threshold altar of the race was hallowed as the place where the author of life met and blessed the loving union". It has also been suggested that "the threshold marks the limit which separates the friendly house-spirits from the vagrant hostile ghosts"; or "that both the threshold and the foundation stone (both possibly originally identical) were analogues of the Ashma stone of India, and of the Churinga of the natives of Australia; in short that they represented the sacred stones in which the ancestral spirit was confined"; Crooks, l. 1.

superstitions connected with it, but these fail to give any satisfactory explanation for the presence of spirits in its neighborhood. This can only be accounted for, it seems to me, by the wide-spread custom of burying the dead under the threshold or before the door,¹—a custom which, I think, can be shown to have prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans.²

We know, in the first place, that in early Greece bodies were buried inside the dwelling. Ps.-Plato, *Min.* 315 D expressly tells us that this was the ancient custom,³ and at Thoricus, Aegina, and elsewhere⁴ graves have been found in the floor and walls of houses. That the Greeks also buried their dead under the threshold and before the house-door we must conclude from the following evidence: Neoptolemos was buried under the threshold⁵ of the temple at Delphi (Schol. in Pind. *Nem.* 7, 62). In the *Hel.* of Euripides 1165 sq. Theoklymenos addressing the tomb of his father says ἐπ' ἐξόδοισι γὰρ | ἔθαψα, Πρωτεύ, σ' ἔνεκ' ἐμῆς προσήσεως. The custom, too, of placing the shrines of heroes before the house-door would seem to point to a more primitive time when the dead body itself was buried there;⁶ and with these heroes, perhaps, should be classed the "antelii daemones"⁷ spoken of by Tert. *de idol.* 15, cf. *de cor. mil.* 13, as guardians of the doors among the Greeks. It may be noted, too, that altars were commonly erected both before the house and temple

¹ Cf. Lippert, *Relig. d. Eur. Culturv.* 135; 309 sq.; Hittell, *Mankind in Anc. Times* 1, 257 sq.; Preuss, *Die Begräbnisart d. Amer. u. Nordostas.* pp. 30 sq.; Trumbull, p. 25.

² This theory was suggested by Winternitz, l. l., in order to account for the lifting of the bride, the purpose of which was, he concludes, "dem Zauber der sich an die Schwelle heftete, zu entgehen". And after I had gathered the material for this paper, there appeared the article by Eitrem referred to above, in which he adopts this theory not only to explain the superstitions connected with doors, but primarily the character of Hermes as god of the dead. The custom of placing the statues of Hermes before the door, on the boundaries and cross-roads, was due to the fact that "Hermes wird da verehrt, wo man die Toten begraben hat". Cf. my review in *A. J. P.* 31 (1910), pp. 93 sq.

³ Cf. *Plut. Phoc.* 37; Rohde 1, 228, n. 3; 2, 340, n. 3.

⁴ Cf. Frazer, *Paus.* v. 2, p. 533; v. 5, 591; Eitrem, pp. 4 sq.

⁵ Cf. the custom of burying in and under the city gate; *Paus.* 5, 4, 4, with Frazer's note; *Herod.* 1, 187; Rohde 1, 160 and notes.

⁶ Cf. *Herod.* 6, 69; Kaibel, *epigr.* 84; ref. in Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 1335 sq.; Rohde 1, 197, n. 2.

⁷ Cf. Pauly-Wiss., under the words; cf. *Clem. Alex. Protr.* 4.

threshold,¹ and it was on these altars that all blood offerings were made.²

In order to show that similar burial customs were current among the early Romans, we have to rely chiefly upon analogy, for literary evidence is scanty and by no means convincing. The only references for Roman burial within the house are Serv. Aen. 5, 64;³ cf. 6, 152, and Isid. Or. 15, 11, 1; for burial near the house door, a statement by Fulgentius⁴ that children under forty days old⁵ were buried under the eaves of the house on the yard side. We know, however, that in Rome, as in various cities in Greece,⁶ burial was permitted within the city, for graves of the fourth century have been found within the Servian Wall;⁷ and the analogies between Roman customs and beliefs in connection with the house door should have sufficient weight to warrant the conclusion that, at some time in their history, they practiced the same burial customs. If the worship of the Lares developed, as I believe, out of ancestor worship, the placing of their statues before the house door would form a parallel to the Greek custom

¹ Cf. Aeschyl. Supp. 494; Eurip. Andr. 1098; Saglio in Darem.-Sagl. Lex. s. v. ara, I, 348.

² Cf. Ov. Met. 7, 601 (cf. above, p. 259); ib. 10, 224; Saglio, l. 1.

³ Domi suae sepeliebantur unde orta est consuetudo ut dii penates colerentur in domibus. Cf. De Marchi, op. cit., I, 38.

⁴ P. 560, 13 Merc. (cf. ed. Helm, p. 113, 19); cf. the Lares grundules, Arnob. 1, 28; Wissowa, Relig. d. R., p. 153, n. 6; De Marchi, l. 1. The above references, according to Marq.-Momm. Staatsv. 3, 309, n. 1; Fowler, Clas. Rev. 10, 395; 11, 34 sq.; Rohde, Psy. 1, 228, n. 3, are not conclusive; they are accepted by Voigt, R. Alterth., pp. 794-5; De Marchi, l. 1.

⁵ In Russia still-born children are buried under the threshold, cf. Ralston, Folk Songs of the Russ. People 136 sq. The fact that Verg. A. 6, 427 puts the souls of little children on the threshold of Hades, may point to a primitive custom of actual burial under the threshold of the home; cf. Conington's note on this passage, and King, Cl. Rev. 17, 83 sq. The excavations at Tell Ta'annek in Palestine show that the ancient inhabitants of this region buried young children in the house; cf. Sellin, Denkschr. d. Wien. Akad. phil.-hist. Kl. 50 (1904) IV, pp. 33 sq.; 36. The wide-spread belief in rebirth, and such an idea as that of the Algonquin Indians, who would bury little children by the wayside, "that their souls might enter into mothers passing by, and hence be born again", would furnish the reason for such burial customs; cf. Dieterich, Mutter Erde 21 sq.

⁶ Cf. Paus. 5, 4, 4, c. Frazer's note; Bekker, Char.², 3, 105 sq.; Eitrem, pp. 4 sq.

⁷ Cf. Jahrb. d. Arch. 22, 1908, p. 443; Mon. Ant. 15, 1905, p. 752; De Marchi, l. 1.; Cic. de leg. 2, 58.

in regard to the heroa.¹ The statues of famous men, at all events, were placed there, and the fact that the "hostium spolia" were affixed to them² points to an earlier cult: cf. Pl. N. H. 35, 7: *aliae foris et circa limina animorum ingentium imagines erant adfixis hostium spoliis quae nec emptori refigere liceret, triumphabantque etiam dominis mutatis emptae domus*; cf. Verg. Aen. 7, 177 sq.³

There are, moreover, convincing evidences that the cult which, as the examples quoted above show, was connected with the threshold and the door, can have been concerned, in origin, at least, only with the spirits of the dead. This we must conclude to be the meaning of the binding of the door-posts with wool, which was used frequently in purificatory and other rites connected with the dead,⁴ and the practice of smearing them with fat and oil which were sprinkled, evidently as offerings, upon graves and grave-stones;⁵ so the olive, laurel, and cypress were closely associated with the cult of the dead, and were commonly placed on graves.⁶ This is true of lamps, also, which were so frequently placed before doors.⁷ The *χθόνια λουτρά*, too, the "aqua adferea" or "adferial" of the Romans,—the water,

¹ Cf. above, pp. 262, 265. Compare the explanation of the ancients themselves that the Lares=Manes or *ἡρώες*; Arnob. 3, 41; Dion. Hal. 3, 70; 4, 2, 14; Wissowa, op. cit., p. 153; Prel.-Jord., R. My. 2, 102 sq.

² Or to the door-posts: cf. Tibull. 1, 1, 54; Prop. 3, 9, 26; Hor. Od. 4, 15, 6; Pers. 6, 45; Stat. Theb. 3, 581; so on the doors of Cacus' cave (Verg. A. 8, 196), human heads were hung.

³ The Greek and Roman custom of laying the dead body out near or upon the threshold may have been a survival of primitive burial there; cf. Hom. Il. 19, 212; Schol. Arist. Lys. 611; Ter. Phor. 97; Verg. A. 11, 29; Pers. 3, 105.

⁴ Cf. Alciph. 3, 37; Diels, Sibyl. Blät. 70; Samter, l. l., 37 sq.; Gruppe, Gr. M. 892, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. Plut. Arist. 21; Eurip. Iph. T. 633; Samter 82 sq.; cf. too, the custom of anointing stones and other fetishes with oil; Lang, Cust. and Myth. 52; Usener Rh. M. 50, 147.

⁶ The dead were laid out upon olive branches, Pl. 35, 160; cf. Ael. v. h. 6, 6; Plut. Lyc. 27; cf. their use in purificatory rites, Soph. O. C. 484. For laurel wreaths sculptured on tombs, cf. C. I. L. 6, 10328; in purification, cf. Schol. Eurip. Alc. 98; Pl. 15, 135; cf. Eurip. Ion 102 sq. Cypress grew in the lower world, Petron. 120, 75; in haunted groves, Sen. Thyest. 654; Stat. Theb. 4, 459; on graves, Paus. 8, 14, 4.

⁷ Cf. Tert. de idol. 15; apol. 35; placed on graves, Petron. 111, 4; cf. Diels, l. l., 47 sq.

namely, in which the dead body was washed and which was poured upon the grave as an offering,¹ was also as a spirit-offering, as I believe, poured out before the house-door. This is indicated, it seems to me, by a fragment of Aristophanes, *Her.* 306 K: μήτε ποδάνιπτρον θύραζ' ἐκχεῖτε μήτε λούτριον. Pouring this water before the door was thought to prevent the return of the soul,² but the explanation of this belief can only be that this water was originally an offering to the soul, which, like all spirit-offerings, by satisfying its needs prevented its return.³ These χθόνια λουτρά are similar in nature to the ἀπόνιμα,⁴—the blood of a sacrificial victim which was washed off from those who underwent purification, and poured into a trench to the west of a tomb, with the words, οἷς χρὴ καὶ οἷς θέμις; a sacrifice to the dead could not be more clearly indicated. Similar, too, is the offering of black ram's blood made by Medea in *Ov. Met.* 7, 243 (cf. above, p. 259, and *Hos. Geta Med.* 322 sq.), an offering which she pours in a trench near the house-door.⁵ The custom, indeed, of burying substances under the threshold must have originated in the idea that they were offerings to the dead, and it was because they were offerings and satisfied the needs of the spirits that they came to be considered prophylactic. Nothing could speak more eloquently for the truth of this statement than the words of *Ov. F.* 2, 573, in his account of Tacita: "et digitis tria tura tribus sub limine ponit/qua brevis occultum mus sibi fecit iter"; mice were daemonic beasts⁶ and "tus" was a common spirit offer-

¹ Cf. *Suid.* s. v.; *Hesych.* s. v.; *Diogen.* 8, 69; *Xenob.* 6, 45; *Lat. Thes.* s. v. adferial.

² Cf. *Riess*, A. J. P. 18, 191, to whom I owe the reference. He compares the similar Germ. custom, *Wuttke*, sec. 732; and modern Greek, *Wachsmuth*, d. alte Gr. im Neuen 119; 129.

³ An interesting parallel to these practices is furnished by two West Indian customs; cf. *F-L Jour.* 15 (1904), pp. 88, 206: "In Jamaica the water that washed dead body (sic) is thrown upon the grave. Elsewhere, however, when a person dies, the water in which the body is washed must be put on one side, and as the funeral leaves the house, it must be dashed after the hearse, otherwise the duppy will haunt the house".

⁴ Cf. *Athen.* 9, 404, E; *Harrison*, *Proleg.* 59 sq.

⁵ For this manner of making a sacrifice to the spirits of the dead, cf. *Stat. Theb.* 4, 442 sq., esp. 454 sq.; and see above, p. 259, n.

⁶ Cf. *Apul. Met.* 2, 22. On the mouse as chthonic, cf. *Gruppe*, *Gr. M.* 803, n. 1 sq.

ing.¹ This idea may not have been the only motive which led to this practice, but it is significant that of the substances which are mentioned in the examples quoted above,² the sheep, the ass, the dog, the sea-onion, the πανσπερμία,—and the cucumber which wrapped in wool was thrown before the door,—all occur as direct offerings to chthonic powers or in close connection with them.³ This relation between the threshold, the spirits of the dead, and the cross-roads where, I believe, the dead were also buried,⁴ may be further illustrated by the words of Plato, Leg. 933 A sq., where he speaks about the prevalence of the belief in magic: ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δυσωπουμένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ ἄξιον ἐπιχειρεῖν πείθειν, ἂν ποτε ἄρα ἴδωσί που κήρινα μιμήματα πεπλασμένα, εἴτ' ἐπὶ θύραις εἴτ' ἐπὶ τριόδοις εἴτ' ἐπὶ μνήμασι γονέων αὐτῶν τινες.

We may also, I think, if we accept this evidence for burial under the threshold or near the house-door explain the words of Eurip. Alc. 101: χαιῖτα ῥ' οὐτις ἐπὶ προθύροις/τομαῖος ἃ δὴ νεκύων/πένθει πίννει. The shorn hair was heaped up at the door as the primitive place of burial just as it was commonly placed upon the graves of the dead.⁵ Interesting evidence for this is the story told by Herod. 4, 34. In describing the honors paid to the dead Hyperoche and Laodike by the Delians, he says: αὐ

¹ Cf. its use in charms, Verg. Ecl. 8, 66; Ov. M. 9, 154; cf. Heim, Incantamenta, p. 561; its use in funeral rites, Lactant. 1, 20, 26; 4, 18, 12.

² Pp. 254 sq. I omit the draco, but if Pl. means "anguis", for its chthonic character, cf. Gruppe, Gr. M., pp. 807 sq.

³ The sheep offered to spirits of the dead; cf. Lucret. 3, 52; Stat. Th. 4, 443; Luc. Nekyom. 9; to Hecate, Ap. Rh. 3, 1031. The ass was connected with Empusa, Suid. s. v.; with Typhon, Plut. Is. 30; cf. Gruppe, Gr. M. 797 sq.; was sacrificed to Trivia, Ov. F. 1, 391; to the winds, Hesych. s. v. ἀνεμώτας. The dog was sacrificed to Hecate: Theocr. 2, 12, c. Schol.; to the chthonic Mana, Pl. 29, 58, cf. Wissowa, Rel. d. Röm. 196; Deubner, AR. 13 (1910), 503 sq. The sea-onion was used in purification, Diphil. fr. 126 K; Luc. Nek. 7, cf. Rohde, Psy. 2, 406. The πανσπερμία was offered on the Chytroi, cf. Rohde 1, 238 sq. The cucumber occurs in a magic rite in Varro de R. R. 1, 2, 25, where every detail shows that it was used as a spirit-offering.

⁴ This is also Eitrem's opinion, op. cit., p. 11. He cites Kaibel, Epigr. 143, of a young child buried ἐπὶ τριόδῳ. We may note that, according to Plato Leg. 873 B the bodies of those who had committed suicide were cast upon the cross-roads and stones heaped upon them; cf. Jevons, Cl. Rev. 9 (1895), 247 sq. This custom, or that of burial upon the cross roads, may explain the reference to corpses in Petron. 134, 2 and Suet. Vesp. 5.

⁵ Aeschyl. Choeph. 4; Petron. 111, 9; Prop. 1, 17, 21; Sen. Phaedr. 1190; cf. Frazer, Paus. v. 4, p. 136; 2, 534.

<κούραι> μὲν πρὸ γάμου πλόκαμον ἀποταμνόμεναι καὶ περὶ ἄτρακτον εἰλίξασαι ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα τιθεῖσι (τὸ δὲ σῆμά ἐστι ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δὲ οἱ εἰλαίη). It may be noted, too, that a threshold sacrifice, evidently founded upon a common folk practice, is preserved in Mag. Pap. V. III, 27. I may add, also, that this evidence for threshold sacrifice and for burial beneath the threshold receives strong confirmation from analogous customs among other peoples, both Aryan and non-Aryan.¹

Such a conclusion affords a simple explanation for all the folk beliefs and practices connected with the house-door.² Spirits haunted the vicinity, as they wandered like shadows about tombs; (Plat. Phaed. 81 C sq.; Stat. Th. 9, 299; 12, 247 sq.; Lact. Inst. 2, 2, 6); because of the presence of these spirits of the dead the threshold, like the cross-roads, was a spot peculiarly adapted to the performance of magic rites, just as such rites were often performed on graves (cf. Plat. Leg. 933 A sq.; Pl. N. H. 28, 226); it was bad luck to stumble on the threshold, just as it brought pollution to walk upon a grave (Plut. Lyc. 27; Sen. Troad. 492); the threshold as the source of prophetic inspiration is to be compared with the familiar grave-oracles (cf. Rohde, Psy. 1, 186 sq.), and the fact that the spirits of the dead foretold the future (Hor. S. 1, 8, 29; Stat. Th. 4, 635; August. de civ.

¹ In ancient India, "bali" offering made on the threshold, cf. Sacr. Bks. E. 2, 107; 30, 22. In Egypt, a hog, everywhere a chthonic animal, was annually offered to Osiris before the house-door, cf. Herod. 2, 48. In modern Greece a pomegranate is broken on the threshold at the time of marriage, Rodd, Cust. and Lore 95 sq. In Japan salt is sprinkled on the threshold after a funeral, cf. Griffis, Mikado's Emp. 467; 470; cf. further Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 122 sq.; 27 sq. With the old Semitic custom of sacrificing a sheep upon the threshold of the house before a returned traveller could enter (cf. AR. 13 (1910), p. 80), may be compared the Gr. practice of compelling such a person to go through a symbolical rebirth, cf. Plut. Q. R. 5; Jevons, Cl. R. 9 (1895), 247 sq. In Rome he was made to enter the house through a hole in the roof, Plut. l. l.

² Here should be classed, too, the belief that the automatic opening of doors was a bad omen, although the house-door is not concerned; in Cic. de div. 2, 31, 67 of a shrine of Hercules; in Suet. Jul. 81, cf. Jul. Obs. 127, fores cubiculi; Suet. Ner. 46 of the Maus. August.; Lamprid. vit. Comm. 16, of the temple of Janus; cf. Stat. Th. 7, 407 where the omen is "clausae—sponte fores." Similarly the trembling of doors denoted the presence of a god; cf. Verg. A. 3, 90; 6, 82; Ov. Met. 4, 486; 15, 671; 9, 782; Stat. Silv. 3, 1, 164; Orph. Arg. 988.

dei 7, 35); offerings were placed upon the threshold or near the house-doors, and wreaths were hung thereon, as upon graves (Eurip. Iph. T. 633; Plut. Sol. 21; Catull. 101; Tibull. 2, 6, 31; 2, 4, 48; Prop. 3, 16, 23); the ground in the vicinity was holy ground, and a refuge for the distressed and suppliant as was the grave itself (Tibull. 2, 6, 33; cf. Rohde, l. l., 1, 230); and finally the teaching of Pythagoras that one should approach doors with due reverence finds its parallel in the statement that one must pass by a hero's shrine in silence (Arist. Av. 1490, c. Schol.; Alciph. 3, 58, 3).

M. B. OGLE.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

II.—LUCILIUS ON *EI* AND *I*.

It is the custom, rightly or wrongly, to consider that when Lucilius gave rules for the use of *ei* and *i* to represent the long *i*, he did not know what he was talking about. Typical comments are the following:

Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 9: "Lucilius prescribed rules for the use of *ei* and '*i* longa'; but instead of keeping *ei* for the original diphthong, and the single letter for the original long vowel, he used foolish distinctions,¹ if we are to believe Velius Longus (56. 7 K.) . . .". The note referred to after the word *distinctions* reads: "Or should we call them mnemonic, as opposed to scientific, distinctions, meant to impress the orthographic rules on the memory of the common people for whom Lucilius wrote his book? (see Lucil. 26. 1. M.)".

Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 86: "Bisweilen hat Lucilius hier zufällig das etymologisch Richtige getroffen, doch geben die kurzen Stücke, die von seinen Regeln erhalten sind, kein Anrecht darauf, ihm in allen Fällen absolutes Zutrauen entgegenzubringen". Ib., p. 368: "Auch Lucilius schreibt im G. sg. *-i* gegenüber *-ei* im N. pl. vor (IX, 16 ff. M.), doch geht seine Unterscheidung wohl von schulmeisterlichen Spekulationen aus und stimmt nur zufällig mit dem Verhalten des älteren inschriftlichen Materials überein".

However, a closer investigation of the Lucilian passages has led the writer to think that perhaps the rules which he lays down have more basis in reason than is generally conceded to them. To discuss this matter is the purpose of this paper.

In the first place, it has been definitely settled that the confusion in spelling of original *ei* and earlier *i* (either original or due to compensatory lengthening) does not appear until just after 150 B. C. Earlier than this the inscriptions consistently employ *EI* or (occasionally) *E* for original *ei*, and never show *EI* for earlier *i*. But by 150 the sound of the diphthong, after passing through an intermediate stage *ē*, became identical with that of earlier *i*, and confusion in spelling resulted, *EI* and *I*

being used indiscriminately for the sound, of whichever origin it might be.¹

The fragments of Lucilius, in which rules are given for correct orthography in this matter, occur in the ninth book of the Satires, written in the period 116-110 B. C., according to Marx. At this time the confusion of the sounds was a long established matter; but that does not prove that Lucilius was unable to make the distinctions. Lucilius was born in the year 180, and had reached his thirtieth year before the two sounds became confused in writing. He had therefore learned the orthography prevalent in the first half of the second century before Christ, in which the confusion did not exist, and when he sets down rules for spelling in this matter, we may expect him to hand over to us the rules which had been taught him in his boyhood and which he had used in his own early manhood. Thus there is every reason *a priori* to believe that his dicta in this matter are based on real knowledge of the practices before the confusion existed.

In dealing with the fragments on this topic, it is to be remembered that the readings of the MSS are not to be depended upon in the least for the use of *ei* and *i*² in the words cited as examples: these examples must be spelled according to the remarks which the author proceeds to make concerning them. Now the text of these lines, according to the edition of Marx, is as follows:

'meille' hominum, duo 'meilia', item huc e utroque opus, 'meiles'	
'meilitiam'. tenues i: 'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'	
quo <i>piso</i> , tenues. si plura haec feceris pila	360
quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.	
porro hoc si filius Luci	A-
fecerit, <i>i solum</i> , ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.	
iam 'pueri venere' e postremum facito atque i,	-B-
ut pueri plures fiant. i si facis solum,	365
'pupilli, pueri, Lucili', hoc unius fiet.	
mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furzi	-C
iusseris	
'hoc illi factum est uni', tenue hoc facies i:	
'haec ille fecere', addes e, ut pinguius fiat.	370

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 86.

² Cf. Anderson, T. A. P. A., XXXVII 73-86, especially 84-86.

In the first passage, 358-361, all editors take *item huc e utroque opus* as referring to the following examples, *meiles meilitiam*; they therefore apply *tenuēs i*, following *meilitiam*, to the following *pilam*, etc. To this there are two objections: the passage contains four examples or sets of examples, and four comments upon the spellings, alternating with each other; it seems at first sight that each example or set of examples needs a comment—then *item huc e utroque opus* refers to the preceding, and each of the other comments refers to what precedes it. The usual interpretation gives two comments to the third set of examples, one or the other of which is superfluous, and gives none to the first set, which needs comment. Secondly, if no comment be given to the first set of examples, it will not be clear¹ how they are to be spelled, since the verses seem intended for oral instruction.² I would therefore unhesitatingly place a period after *opus*, and another after *tenuēs i*.

To take up first *item huc e utroque opus*: the text is a manifest improvement over the *huic utroque* of Dousa and most editors, the *heice utroque* of Müller, and the *hisce utroque* of Keil, since it follows exactly the codex. Marx³ supports the reading *huc* by citing Plaut. Rudens 726:

Tu, senex, si istas amas, huc arido argentost opus,

in which *huc* replaces the dative of possession. *Utroque* now offers difficulty, since the meaning is manifestly "both these need e", and yet it cannot be dative. The dative in -o in *uter* and its compounds is a late Latin peculiarity, not found before Apuleius.⁴ As an ablative *utroque* might agree with *e*—"these need both e's", but the sense and the manner of expression are not clear. It is more likely that as *huc*, adverb of direction whither, replaces the dative, *utroque*, likewise the adverb of direction whither, has replaced the dative also, and that *huc utroque* is a colloquial equivalent of *his verbis utrique*; the meaning is therefore "these words both need e". This interpretation, moreover, confirms the correctness of the reading *huc*. Marx⁵ apparently takes this view of *utroque*, though he refers it to what follows instead of to what precedes, saying: *utroque* ad duo vocabula quae secuntur pertinet adver-

¹ Cf. preceding footnote.

² Cf. p. 278.

³ II 134.

⁴ Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre d. lat. Spr. II³, pp. 541 ff.

⁵ II 134.

bium; but the brevity of his expression leaves uncertain his exact interpretation of the manner in which it denotes them.

Marx¹ considers that the monosyllable *e* suffers elision; but this is not to be admitted. It is well known that the interjection *O* does not suffer elision, though if metrically unaccented it is sometimes shortened before an initial vowel. Marx's index² cites *e* in this line and in 370, *pro* 1266, *nam* 215, *ne* 266, *si* 313, *cum* 456, *te* 1304, *dem* 577, as monosyllables suffering elision; but of *pro*, *nam*, *ne*, *si*, *cum*, *te*, *dem* there is a consonantal remnant after the elision. In 370 the reading of Marx is *addes e, ut*; but Schmidt's *adde e, ut* avoids the necessity of total elision. In the present passage total elision of *e* is even less permissible: forms of *uter* in Lucilius invariably have the initial syllable short, as we can see from Marx's own index³ (vv. 419, 584, 781, 1011, 1119); and with total elision of *e*, the meter would require this initial syllable to be long. Now the names of letters form long syllables, as we see in vv. 361, 363, 364, 365, 367; I therefore scan *hūc ē ūtrōque*, with shortening of the (metrically unaccented) long vowel before an initial vowel, a frequent phenomenon in the earlier poets.

Turning now to the words whose orthography Lucilius is discussing, I adopt Dousa's *meillia* for *meilia*, since the Monumentum Ancyranum authorizes *ll* in the plural of this word as well as in the singular. Though early inscriptions do not write doubled letters, the consonants, if pronounced double, appear doubled in writing from 189 B. C. onward, and this spelling became the established method by the time of the Gracchi,⁴ which is before the composition of this passage. Lucilius would undoubtedly conform to this norm, as the doubling was in accord with the pronunciation, and the single writing was not and never had been.

In applying the comment *item huc e utroque opus* to the examples *meille* and *meillia*, only one point remains to be considered—the meaning of *item*. *Item* usually means *in the same manner as* something that has gone before, thus correlating two things or sets of things. But here, if this comment refers to *meille* and *meillia*, it must refer either to some example immediately preceding the citation, which is most unlikely; or mean *aeque*, that is, "both need *e*, *meille* and *meillia* alike". While

¹ II 134.

² I 155.

³ I 163, *elisis monosyllabi*.

⁴ Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 8.

this is not a violent shift of meaning, still no example of such use can be found by me, and I therefore propose this punctuation:

'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item: huc e utroque opus.

Item now has its usual meaning, 'in the same way as the preceding', and emphasizes the fact that both singular *meille* and plural *meillia* have *ei*, unlike singular *pueri* (genitive) with *i* and plural *puerei* (nominative) with *ei*, as we see in 364-366. It is no objection to this punctuation that there is now no caesura, but a break at the end of the third foot; Lucilius furnishes abundant examples of this:

- 34 quare diuinis quicquam? *an tu qua* <ere> re debes
 82 non dico; 'uincat' licet, et uagus exulet, erret
 173 cumque hic tam formosus homo ac te dignus puellus
 203 nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset
 293 tristis, difficiles sumus, fastidimus bonorum

and 109, 111, 171, 179, 189, 260, 271, all with similar metrical defects, though of slightly varying natures. Yet these 12 lines all occur within the first 300 verses of Lucilius (edition of Marx).

Lucilius testifies therefore to *meille*, *meillia*. Unfortunately this is one of the uncertain words, not occurring in inscriptions early enough to show its etymology, so far as the vowel of the initial syllable is concerned. Its earliest occurrence is on the milestone of Popilius, C. I. L. I 551, where *MEILIA* and *MILIARIOS* both occur; as the date of the inscription is 132 B. C., we hereby get no information. But as Sommer's derivation¹ of *mille* from **smī ghstī*, though accepted by Walde,² has been by Brugmann³ relegated to a place among the improbabilities, it is at least possible that Lucilius may be right in spelling *meille* and *meillia* with the diphthong.

The next portion of the text, taking *tenuis i* to refer to the preceding and not to the following, is:

'meiles'

'militiam', *tenuis i*.

Scaliger changed the *mille militiam* of the codex to this form as cited, understanding *item*, etc., to refer to these two words. While he was unquestionably right in identifying the words, his

¹ I. F. X 216-220, XI 323-324.

² Lat. etym. Wörterb. s. v., even in the second edition.

³ I. F. XXI 10-13.

faulty interpretation of the comment caused him to insert an unwarranted *e* in each one. We must read:

'miles'

'militiam', *tenues i*.

This *i*, not *ei*, in these words is confirmed by the inscriptions. *TRIBVNOS MILITARE* occurs in C. I. L. I 63, presumably older than the second Punic war, and *TRIB MIL* is found in C. I. L. I 35, probably of the period 160 to 155 B. C. Both of these are early enough to show distinction between the simple long vowel and the diphthong, and agree in their evidence. Lucilius is therefore right in assigning the simple long vowel to *miles*¹ and to *militiam*.

Lucilius' discrimination between *meille* and *miles* in the matter of spelling is the more interesting because the antiquarian Varro, some 65 years later than Lucilius, considered *miles* to be a derivative of *meille*: L. L. V 89 milites, quod trium milium primo legio fiebat ac singulae tribus Titiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum milia militum mittebant. While avoiding this error, Lucilius has also avoided any voicing of the silly notion of his friend Aelius Stilo, cited by Paul. Fest., p. 122 M.: Militem Aelius a mollitia κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν dictum putat, eo, quod nihil molle, sed potius asperum quid gerat; sic ludum dicimus, in quo minime luditur.

Marx's reading for 359 makes *-es i pi-* a dactyl; but comparison with 361, 363, 364, 365, 367 shows that *i* and *e* as names of letters are long syllables. This in itself proves that the syllables are to be reduced by one; but if further proof be needed, we have only to recall that Lucilius is discussing the spelling of *i*, not of *ī*, and that *pi-* must be *pī-*. The codices here have *tenues i*, which is kept by most editors, though Müller has *tenuest i*. I propose *tenue i*, similar to *i solum* in 363; their equivalence in meaning is shown by the phrases *tenue hoc facies i* 369 and *i si facis solum* 365. *Tenue i* would easily become corrupted to *tenue si* from the *si* of the next line, whence came *tenues i* of the codices. It is to be emphasized that *tenues i*, in which *tenues* is the present subjunctive of *tenuāre*,² has the

¹ Kent, T. A. P. A. XLI 1-5.

² *Tenues* cannot be the plural feminine adjective, for names of letters are neuter in Lucilius, as we see in 363, 365, and in

351 A primum est, hinc incipiam.

379 S nostrum et semigraecei quod dicimus sigma

metrical value $\cup \cup - -$, though it stands for $\cup \cup -$; and that the verb *tenuet* alone (the only alternative to *tenuet i*) would be remarkable, since all other comments mention the letter *e* or *i*—except that in 360, which likewise is suspicious from the lack of the name of the letter. Marx¹ relies upon the use of *attenuatio* in Auct. ad Herenn. IV 21, 29, to justify the use of the verb *tenuare*. The passage is: *adnominatio . . . multis et variis rationibus conficitur. attenuatione aut complexione eiusdem litterae sic . . .* The examples that follow show that *attenuatio* is the 'exclusion', *complexio* the 'inclusion' of the letter in question. The object of the verb *tenuare* would then of necessity be the name of the letter, not the word containing the letter. Now *tenuare* in this sense would be a strictly technical word, and without its object expressed would be distinctly difficult to understand. But Lucilius himself tells us:²

595 nec doctissimis <nec scribo indoctis nimis>. Man<i>ium
596 Persium<ue> haec legere nolo, Iunium Congum uolo,

in which the additions are by Marx, following the evidence of Crassus ap. Cic. de Or. II 6, 25: *nam ut C. Lucilius, homo et doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi uelle, quod alteri nihil intellegerent, alteri plus fortasse quam ipse, de quo etiam scripsit "Persium non curo legere"*. It is quite in accord with this that we find that all these precepts on *i* and *ei* are couched in the simplest language, containing not a single technical term, and at times even of a half jocular nature, as in *cum dare furei iusseris*.³ In fact, they seem to be mere mnemonic devices, as Lindsay⁴ suggests, and may be paralleled by the English jingles on the defective declension of *nemo*:

Of *nemo* never let me see
Neminis and *nemine*,

and on the spelling of *ei* and *ie*:

I before *e*,
Except after *e*,
And when sounded as *a*,
As in *neighbor* and *weigh*.

¹ II 134.

² V. p. 282.

³ Apud Plin. N. H. praef. 7.

⁴ V. p. 272.

Therefore *tenues*, a severely technical term, would be out of harmony with the purpose of these rules. But *tenue i*, 'a slender *i*', as opposed to a 'fat' diphthong, is a term readily intelligible to all. The correct reading in 359 is accordingly *tenue i*.

The case of *militiam* is noteworthy. Marx¹ on *pilam* says: *Accusativum non tolles cum antea legatur "meilitiam", postea "pilum quo piso tenues"*. But *militiam* is here in the accusative merely *metri gratia*; as for *pilam*, its position between *militiam* and *pilum* (which may be either nominative or accusative) causes its assimilation in ending to the other two. As we have seen, *tenues* here and in the following line is hardly a verb governing these examples as objects; against this are the considerations just mentioned, and the case of *miles*, which is coordinate with *militiam*.

The next set of examples, with the comment, is:

'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'
quo piso, tenues.

Marx² defends the *in* by citing

641 cum <in> stadio, in gymnasio, in duplici corpus siccassem pila

and adds: Itaque *i* brevis semper secundum Lucilium *i* sola scribenda est. There is however an essential difference: *duplex pila* is the name of a specific game, while *pila* alone is not. Besides this, we have already seen that the length of the name of the letters forbids his text here, certainly preventing us from considering *pilam* as a possibility. Moreover, Lucilius is not (pace Marx) dealing here with *i*, but with *z*. If then the word be *pilam*, it is either the word *pila* 'pillar' or the word *pila* 'mortar'. Which it is, is clearly shown by Velius Longus GL. VII 56 K.: idemque *peila* quibus milites utuntur per *e* et *i* scribenda existimat, at *pila* in qua pinsetur per *i* (*sic cod.*).³ *Pilam* therefore is the word meaning 'mortar'. *In qua* is accordingly entirely in place; but the *lusimus* is manifestly wrong. The perfect tense strikes our attention at once: Dousa took such offense that he emended it to the present *ludimus*; all editors followed

¹ II 134.

² II 134.

³ This is the passage that misled Müller into emending *pilum quo* to *pilam qua*.

him until Marx, who conservatively returned to the reading of the codex. By the principle of the *lectus difficilior lusimus* can hardly come from *ludimus*. But if *pilam* mean 'mortar', *pinsi-**mus* is the word that must have stood here, and this reading is hinted at by the citation from Velius Longus. The corruption is easily followed. The three strokes of *in* became reduced to two, and these, being between consonants, were read as the vowel *u*; then the influence of *pilam*, understood as *pilam*, caused the scribe to change the unintelligible *pusimus* to *lusimus*. Like *pinsimus*, thus proved to have contained the *n*, *pinso* must be written in the next verse, and not *piso*.¹

As for the verb *tenues* 360, the failure to mention the letter under discussion is suspicious, as we have already seen. In order to overcome this difficulty, Dousa changed to *tenues i*, omitting *si* in the next sentence, where it was needed. Therefore, though the subjunctive *tenues* is perfectly intelligible, = *tenue facias*, still the omission of the name of the letter as object and the technical nature of the expression cause me to propose *tenue i*, as in 359. Since this was followed by *si plura*, it might easily, through dittography of the *s*, become *tenues* (or *tenuis* or *tenueis*, either easily changed to *tenues* by a scribe who understood them as being nom.-acc. plurals of *i*-stems). Our text then is:

'pilam' in qua pinsimus, 'pilum'
quo pinso, tenue i.

Pila 'mortar' is from an earlier **pins-lā*, and *pilum* 'pestle' is from earlier **pins-lom*; both are derivatives to *pi(n)so* 'I pound', and have original *i* lengthened by compensation upon the loss of the *s* before the *l*. Lucilius is therefore perfectly justified in requiring *a mere i*, *tenue i*, in both these words.

The next section is:

si plura haec feceris pila
quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

I would here make no change in the text, except that of *pila* to *peila*. The question of the meaning comes up: Does Lucilius mean that *peila* 'spears' has an *e* to distinguish it from the

¹ Therefore *piso* of Marx and *pisunt* of Müller and Keil in the next verse are faulty spellings.

singular of the same word, or does he mean that this distinguishes it from forms of *pila* 'mortar' and *pilum* 'pestle'? If the former, Lucilius is wrong in making such a distinction. Now the passage from Velius Longus, already cited, paraphrases this passage, but takes no account of the question of the number of *peila*; and the Lucilian passage itself states that the purpose of the *e* is "that *peila* may become 'fuller'". Had a discrimination between singular and plural of the word been the point at issue, he would surely have stated the spelling of the singular, and have ended the verse 361 with a (metrical) equivalent of *ut peila plura fiant*; cf. 365 *ut puerei plures fiant*.

Peila 'spears' has therefore, according to Lucilius, the diphthong. The accepted etymology¹ is **pigslom*, to the root *pig-* or *pik-* seen in *pignus* 'fist', etc. An alternative, admitted by Walde as a possibility, is Niedermann's connection² of the word with Lith. *peilis* 'knife', to the root *pei-* without the determinative *k* or *g*. *Pilum* would then be from **pei-lom*, and would have a right to the *e* given it by Lucilius, since it contained the diphthong originally.

The next passage, 362-363, reads:

porro hoc si filius Luci
fecerit, *i solum*, ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.

Lucilius is here discussing the form of the genitive singular of nouns having *-ius* in the nominative, and prescribes the *i* as against the *ei*. Special attention must be called to the fact that he is NOT trying to distinguish *-i* and *-ei*, since *-ei* in such genitives appears for the first time in Catullus;³ yet all editors, following the Roman grammarians,⁴ consider that such is his intent. *i solum*, however, does not necessarily mean one *i* as opposed to two; in 365 *i solum* is used of *i* in *pupilli* and in

¹ Walde, Lat. et. Wörterb., s. v. In the second edition he suggests **peigslom*, "falls des Lucilius . . . *peila* auf echter Tradition fusst"; but this would give **pillum*!

² I. F. XV 113.

³ Cf. Merrill, Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Philol., II, pp. 57-79; though Merrill takes issue with Bentley's dictum on this point, still the genitive in *-ei* is not proved with certainty before Catullus.

⁴ Charis. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1; Cassiod. VII 206, 21-27; Beda VII 251, 6-20; also Marx II 409-410, ad versus 1294-5.

pueri, where there can be no question of *-ii*. Now we know from early inscriptions that the ending of the genitive singular of *o*-stems is *-ī*, not the diphthong,¹ and thus the contraction to a single *ī* in *io*-stems took place early. Lucilius is therefore right in pronouncing the genitive singular of nouns in *-ius* to end in *-ī*, and not in the diphthong.

Verses 364-366 need not be repeated here, since the text is good. Lucilius says that the genitive singular of *o*-stems ends in *-ī* and that the nominative plural ends in *-ei*. That his statement is perfectly correct is shown by the testimony of the older inscriptions.²

The next passage, 367-368, reads:

mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furei
iusseris.

I would read, at the beginning, *mendacēi fureique* (as did Dousa), for evident reasons. It seems a little forced to say "when you bid (someone) make a present to a thief", for of course no one is going to do such a thing. Therefore Lachmann gives in his text cum 'dato, Furei', *iusseris*,³ "when you direct 'You shall give, Furius'", a particularly pointless remark, leaving *mendaci furique* without any connection with the rest of the passage; more than that, the vocative of *Furius* would have *-ī*, not *-ei*, though a statement on this point does not appear in the extant fragments of Lucilius. Müller's cum 'dabis, Furi', *iusseris* has precisely the same defect, though he attaches the fragment directly to 363, and makes *mendaci* and *furi* further examples of genitives of *io*-stems, like *Corneli* and *Cornifici*. The manner in which the citation is given by Quintilian manifestly forbids this. Curiously, the obvious fact that Lucilius was using *dare* merely as a non-technical means of indicating that the forms are in the dative case escaped them, but has since been seen and commented upon by Marx.⁴

Lucilius therefore prescribes *-ei* in the dative singular of consonant stems. That this is correct, is well known.⁵

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 369.

² Sommer, op. cit., p. 368, pp. 377-378.

³ Cf. R. Bouterwek, *Quaestiones Lucilianae*, p. 14, Elberfeld, 1857.

⁴ II 137; so also earlier editors. Cf. also Skutsch, *Glotta* I 310 ftn.

⁵ Sommer, op. cit., p. 408.

The last passage, 369-370, reads :

'hoc illi factum est uni', tenue hoc facies i :
'haec illi fecere', addes e, ut pinguius fiat.

The only change I would suggest is the adoption of Schmidt's *adde* to avoid the total elision of *e*, a matter that has already been discussed. *e* is here before a caesura and bears the metrical stress; it therefore keeps its length, though before a vowel. This change involves, of course, no change in meaning. Lucilius states that the dative singular in such words as *illi* and *uni* ends in *-i*, and the nominative plural masculine of the same words ends in *-ei*. The latter statement is correct; the former is of course incorrect.¹ This is the first definite error in which Lucilius is detected, for *meille*, *meillia*, *peilum* 'spear' are at least possibly right, and all his other examples are surely right. How did he come to err in *illi* and *uni*, dative singular? The reason is, I think, not hard to find, and has already been stated in brief by Marx.² The pronouns and pronominal adjectives with genitive in *-ius* and dative in *-i* are for the rest declined precisely like *o-ā*-stems, with the exception of the masculine nominative singular and the nominative and accusative neuter singular of a few of them. Lucilius therefore associated them with the adjectives of this declension. Finding that the genitive of masculine and neuter nouns with *-us -um -ius -ium* in the nominative, and the vocative singular of masculine nouns with *-ius* in the nominative ended in *-i*, and that on the other hand the nominative and vocative plural of such masculine nouns had *-ei* (or *-iei*) and the dative and ablative plural of the same, whether masculine or neuter, ended in *-eis* (or *-ieis*), he drew the conclusion that in this declension, where there was an *i*-sound, the spelling *i* belonged to the singular and the spelling *ei* belonged to the plural. Thereby he was led into his error in the matter of *illi* and *uni* and other similar datives. Special attention should be paid to the fact that this error did not cause him to go astray in the spelling of the dative singular of consonant stems: possibly the *-is* (not *-eis*) accusative ending in the plural of *i*-stems, whence it was often extended to consonant stems, prevented such an error.

¹Sommer, op. cit., p. 473.

²II 137.

The results of the investigation are:

I. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *ei*:

meille, meillia: this cannot be shown to be wrong.

peilum 'spear': this cannot be shown to be wrong.

ending of nom. voc. pl. of *o*-stems, masc. (and fem.): correct.

Example: *puerei*.

ending of dat. sing. of consonant stems: correct. Examples: *mendacei, furei*.

ending of nom. voc. plur. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: correct. Example: *illei*.

II. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *i*:

miles, militia: correct.

pila 'mortar', *pilum* 'pestle': correct.

ending of gen. sing. of *io*-stems: correct. Examples: *Luci, Corneli, Cornifici, Lucili*.

ending of gen. sing. of *o*-stems: correct. Examples: *pupilli, pueri*.

ending of dat. sing. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: wrong, but reason for error plain. Examples: *illi, uni*.

Our conclusion is that Lucilius is within narrow limits accurate in his rules for the writing of *i* and *ei*, but that he did not understand the linguistic basis for the difference, and therefore fell into one error in the ten rules which he gives us.

Three points may now be treated briefly. In Marius Victorinus GL. VI 18 we find the statement that earlier grammarians prescribed *ei* in *sīca* and in the military *vīnea*, but *i* in *fistula* and in the *vīnea* of viticulture. As there is nothing to connect this statement with Lucilius, I have refrained from comment upon it.

The fragment given by Marx as

1294 — — seruandi numeri et uersus faciendi

1295 nos Caeli Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque,

from Charisius GL. I 78, after Dousa, who fills in the first verse with *quare*, appears in Keil, Müller and Lachmann as

seruandi Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque.

Marx¹ shows however, in his comment on the verses, that they

¹ II 409-410.

are not grammatical rules, but of an entirely different nature, though wrongly understood by Charisius. They therefore do not come within the scope of the present article.

The relative order of the five fragments contained in 358-370 is one upon which there is little evidence. In Quint. I 7 15 the *pueri* passage (364-366) is stated to precede the *mendaci* passage (367-368). In Charis. I 78-79 the *filii Luci* passage (362-363) is stated to precede the *pueri* passage (364-366). In Vel. Long. VII 56 the *pueri* passage (364-366), the *illi* passage (369-370) and a paraphrase of part of the *mille* passage (358-361) are cited in that order, though without a direct or even an indirect implication that this is their relative order in the original. We may infer that the pronouns were treated after the nouns, and place the *illi* passage after the *mendaci* passage. Then the position of 358-361 remains uncertain; but on the slight indication given by Vel. Long. and by the allusion in *item*,¹ I am inclined to place it at the end, instead of at the beginning. The result is precisely the order of Lachmann. Yet as the edition of Marx certainly will be the definitive edition of Lucilius for many years to come, I have not felt justified in changing the order in the text of the fragments which is given later. The following table shows the relative orders given the fragments by the different editors; each passage is cited by the first example in the classical spelling of the word:

Dousa	}	pueri	illi	mille	mendaci	Luci
Ed. Bipontina						
Perreau						
Schmidt		Luci	pueri	illi	mendaci	mille
Gerlach	}	pueri	illi	mendaci	mille	
Elsperger						
Lachmann		Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi	mille
Müller	}	pueri	illi	Luci	mendaci	mille
Merrill						
Marx		mille	Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi

In view of the numerous changes that have in the course of this paper been made in the text and in its interpretation, there now follows the text with translation and critical apparatus, and then the sources for the passages, with other testimonia veterum, are cited in full.

¹ V. p. 276.

I. TEXT, TRANSLATION AND APPARATUS CRITICUS.

The following editions of these fragments of Lucilius have been carefully compared, and their readings appear in the apparatus, as well as the readings of the manuscripts. Of these editions, Elspeger follows precisely the text of Gerlach; Perreau agrees with the Bipontine edition except in having *Lucilli* 366 and *quum* 367; Merrill follows Mueller except in having *puerei* 365, *illei* 370. Except for 362-363, Dousa (p. 113) admits his debt to Scaliger, and his readings are usually cited under Scaliger's name; but I have here consistently cited them under Dousa's own name. Further, no account has been taken of the apostrophe as a typographical substitute for a final *s* not helping to make position.

Dousa. F. Dousa, C. Lucili Satyrarum Reliquiae, 1597, Plantin, Lugd. Bat.

Bipontina. A. Persii Flacci et Dec. Jun. Juvenalis Satirae ad optimas editiones collatae; accedit Sulpiciae satira; C. Lucilii satirographorum principis fragmenta (Societas Bipontina), 1785; Biponti ex typographia Societatis.

Perreau. A. Perreau, Juvenalis et Persius; item Lucilii fragmenta; vol. III, 1830, Lemaire, Paris.

Schmidt. L. F. Schmidt, C. Lucilii Satirarum quae de libro nono supersunt disposita et illustrata, in Programm des Friedrichs-Werderschen Gymnasiums, 1840, Nauck, Berlin.

Gerlach. F. D. Gerlach, C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae, 1846, Meyer et Zeller, Turici.

Elsperger. C. Elspeger, Commentatio de satira Lucilii, in Sollennia Anniversaria in Gymnasio Regio Onoldino, 1851, Bruegel.

Mueller. L. Mueller, C. Lucili Saturarum Reliquiae, 1872, Teubner, Leipzig.

Lachmann. C. Lachmann, C. Lucilii Saturarum, 1876, Reimer, Berlin (Lachmann died 1851, but this was not printed until this date).

Merrill. E. T. Merrill, Fragments of Roman Satire, 1897, American Book Company, New York.

Marx. F. Marx, C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae, 2 vols., 1904-5, Teubner, Leipzig.

Keil. H. Keil, Grammatici Latini, Teubner, Leipzig: vol. I, 1857; vol. VI, 1874; vol. VII, 1880.

- 358 'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item: huc e utroque opus.
 'miles',
 359 'militiam': tenue i. 'pilam' in qua pinsimus, 'pilum'
 360 quo pinso: tenue i. si plura haec feceris 'peila'
 361 quae iacimus, addes e, 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

Meille, a 'thousand', of men, two *meillia*, 'thousands', likewise: these words both need *e*. *Miles*, 'soldier', and *militia*, 'military service'—plain *i*. *Pila*, 'mortar', in which we pound, *pilum*, 'pestle', with which I pound—plain *i*. But if you mention several of these *peila*, 'spears', that we throw, add *e*, that *peila* may become "fuller".

358-361: apud Terentium Scaurum GL. VII 19, 1-4; cf. Marium Victorinum GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10, Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 13-14.

Codices Terentii: *B* Bernensis 330.

P Palatinus 174.

Editio Terentii: ω Basileensis, anno 1527.

358 mille *BP* ω : *meile* *Dousa*, *Bip.*, *Schm.*, *Gerl.*, *Muell.*; *meille* *Lachm.*, *Marx*; mille *Keil*.

duo milia *P* ω , $\overline{\text{II}}$ *B*; duo *meilia* *edd. plurimi*; duo *meillia* *Dousa*, *Bip.*, *Lachm.*

item: *omnes edd. priores ante item dividerunt*; *Kent post*.

huc *BP* ω ; huic *Dousa et edd. plur.*; heice *Muell.* (cf. *Afran. Except. fr. III ap. Frag. Rom. Com. ed.³ Ribb.*); hisce *Keil*; huc *e Marx*.

mille *BP* ω ; *meiles* *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *miles* *Kent*.

359 *militiam* *B* ω , *miliciam* *P*; *meilitiam* *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *militiam* *Kent*. *Post militiam punctum posuerunt omnes edd. priores*; *Kent ante pilam posuit*.

tenues i BP, *tenue si* ω ; *tenues i Dousa et edd. plur.*; *tenuest i Muell.*; *tenue i Kent*.

pilam in qua lusimus BP ω ; *pilam qua ludimus Dousa et edd. plur.*; *pilai qua ludimus Muell.*; *pilam in qua lusimus Marx*; *pilam in qua pinsimus Kent*.

359-360 *pilum quo ipso P* ω , *pilum quo ipse B*.

pilum quo Dousa et edd. plur.; *pilam qua Muell. ex Velio*.

pinso Dousa et edd. plur.; *pisunt Muell. (quod t sequitur)*, *Keil*; *piso Marx*.

360 *tenues si plura haec feceris pila BP* ω .

- 362 porro hoc si filius 'Luci'
 363 fecerit, i solum, ut 'Corneli' 'Cornifici' que.
 364 iam "'puerei' uenere": e postremum facito atque i,
 365 ut puerei plures fiant. i si facis solum,
 366 'pupilli', 'pueri', 'Lucili', hoc unius fiet.

Then if the son *Luci*, 'of Lucius', should do so-and-so, *i* alone, as in *Corneli*, 'of Cornelius', and in *Cornifici*, 'of Cornificius'.

Now "*puerei*, 'the boys', came": set an *e* and ~~and~~ an *i* at the end, that *puerei*, 'the boys', may become several in number. But if you set *i* alone, *pupilli*, 'of an orphan', *pueri*, 'of a boy', *Lucili*, 'of Lucilius', this will mean 'belonging to one'.

tenues i. plura *Dousa et edd. plur.*; tenue. si *Muell., Keil, Marx*; tenue i. si *Kent*.

peila *Dousa et edd. plur.*; pila *Muell., Keil, Marx*.

361 adēē pella ut plenus fiat *B*.

adde se pella ut plenius fiat *P*.

addere pella ut plenius fiat *ω*.

addes e peila ut plenius fiat *Dousa et omnes edd.*

362-363: Apud Charisium GL. I 78, 13-14; cf. Cassiodorum GL. VII 206, 21-27, Bedam GL. VII 251, 6-10 and 16-20.

362 porro hoc uui (*incertum*) fecerit colum ut Corneli Cornificique *codex Neap.*

porro hoc si filius Luci ferit collum ut Corneli Cornificique *Dousa (e cod. Coloniensi iam deperdito), Bip.*

porro hoc si filius Luci: feceris i solum *Schmidt*.

porro hoc sit 'filius Luci': feceris i solum *Muell.*

porro hoc, 'filius Luci', feceris i solum *Lachm., Keil*.

porro hoc si filius Luci fecerit, i solum *Marx*.

363 ut Corneli Cornificique *Dousa et omnes edd.*

Hoc fragmentum Gerlach omisit quod emendari vix posset.

364-366: Apud Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 7-9; dimidia prior apud Quintilianum I 7, 15; dimidia posterior apud Charisium GL. I 79, 1; cf. Aulum Gellium XIII 25, 4, Marium Victorinum VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10.

R editio princeps Velii, Romae, 1587.

364 puerbi *cod. Velii*; puerei, puere, pueri *codd. Quint.*; puerei *edd. omnes*.

367 'mendacei' 'furei'que addes e, cum dare 'furei'
368 iusseris.

369 "hoc 'illi' factum est 'uni'": tenue hoc facies i.

370 "haec 'illei' fecere": adde e, ut pinguius fiat.

To *mendacei*, 'to a liar', and to *furei*, 'to a thief', add an *e*, when you bid something be given *furei*, 'to a thief'.

"So-and-so was done *illi uni*, 'with that one fellow'": make this *i* plain. "*Illei*, 'those fellows', have done so-and-so": add *e*, that the word may become "fatter".

et *cod. Velii*; e, ut, et *codd. Quint.*; e *edd. omnes*.

365 ut plures faciant *cod. Velii et R*; ut pueri plures fiant *codd. Quint.*; ut plures puerei fiant *Dousa, Bip.*; ut pueri plures fiant *Muell.*; ut puerei plures fiant *edd. ceteri, incluso Merrillio*.

366 . . . pueri Lucii hoc unius fieri *cod. Charis*.

pupilli pueri et Lucilli hoc unius fiet *cod. Velii*.

pupilli pueri huc unius fiet *R*.

pupilli pueri Luceili hoc unius fiet *Dousa, Bip., Gerl., Schmidt*.

pupilli pueri Lucilli hoc unius fiet *Perreau*.

pupilli pueri Lucili hoc unius fiet *Lachm., Muell., Keil, Marx*.

367-368: Apud Quintilianum I 7, 15; cf. Aulum Gellium XIII 25, 4.

mendaci furique *codd. et edd. plur.*; mendacei fureique *Dousa, Bip., Gerl.* Post furique punctum posuit *Lachm.*; idem *Muell.*, qui haec nomina ut genetivos singularis numeri versu 363 iunctos intellegit; *ceteri punctum non posuerunt*.

quum *Dousa, Perreau, Schmidt*; cum *ceteri edd.*

dari furei *cod. Lassbergianus vel Friburgensis*. dare furi *cod. Turicensis*, dare fueri *cod. Ambrosianus*; dabis Furi *Muell.*; dato Furei *Lach.*; dare furei *Dousa et ceteri edd. (Lucil. et Quint.)*.

369-370: Apud Velium Longum GL VII 56, 11-12.

R editio princeps *Velii*, Romae, 1587.

369 factum est *cod. et edd. plur.*; factumst *Muell.*

hoc (post tenue) *cod. et edd. plur.*; heic vel huic *Muell.*; heic *Merrill*.

370 haec ille facere addes e ut pinguius facit *cod.*; faciat *R.*
 ille facere facit "*utrumque dudum emendatum*"—*Marx.*
 illei *Dousa et edd. plur., incluso Merrillio*; illi *Muell.*
 addes e *Dousa, Bip., Marx*; adde e *edd. ceteri.*

IV. TESTIMONIA VETERUM.

A. Quintilianus I 7, 15; text of Bonnell, 1854.

diutius duravit, ut E I iungendis eadem ratione qua Graeci
 "uterentur; ea casibus numerisque discreta est, ut Lucilius
 praecepit

iam pueri . . . plures fiant (364–365).

ac deinceps idem:

mendaci . . . iusseris (367–368).

B. Aulus Gellius XIII 25, 4; text of Hosius, 1903.

id quoque in eodem (XXIV) libro Nigidiano animadvertimus:
 si 'huius' inquit 'amici' vel 'huius magni' scribas, unum i facito
 extremum; sin vero 'hii magnii', 'hii amicii'¹ casu multitudinis
 recto, tum <i> ante i scribendum erit², atque id ipsum facies in
 similibus. item, si 'huius terrai' scribas, i littera sit³ extrema,
 si 'huic terrae', per e scribendum est. item, 'mi'⁴ qui scribit in
 casu interrogandi, velut cum dicimus 'mi'⁴ studiosus', per unum
 i scribat, non per e; at cum 'mei'⁵, tum per e et i scribendum
 est, quia dandi casus est.

Potius legendum cum edd. vetustioribus:

1 'hei magnei', 'hei amicei' 2 tum ante i scribendum
 erit e 3 fit 4 'mei' 5 'mehei'

Adnot. crit. ex editione Hosii.:

mi: mi *edd. vet.*, mei ω .

mei: mei γ , miei δ .

ω consensus codicum (A)PRV aut omnium aut reliquorum.

δ archetypus codicum (B)QZ.

γ archetypus codicum NOTX.

C. Charisius GL. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1.

*Lucius et Aemilius et cetera*¹ nomina quae ante u habent i
 duplici i genetivo *singulari* finiri² debent, ne³ necesse sit adversus
*observationem nominum*⁴ nominativo minorem fieri genetivum;
 idque Varro tradens adicit⁵ *vocativum quoque* singularem⁶ talium
 nominum per duplex i⁷ scribi debere, sed *propter differentiam*
 casuum corrumpi.⁸ *Lucilius tamen et per unum i* genetivum⁹

scribi posse existimat: ait enim "servandi Numeri numerum ut¹⁰ servemus *modumque*". numquam enim hoc intulisset, nisi et Numerium per i, huius *Numeri*¹¹ faciendum crederet. denique et in libro *VIII*¹² sic ait

porro . . . Cornificique¹³ (362-363).

et paulo post

pueri . . . fieri (365-366).

Ita restituit locum Keilius, codicis Neapolitani scriptura ex parte deleta; ex codice Coloniensi iam deperdito, cui tamen Marx II 135 fidem tribuit, F. Dousa apud Lucilii reliq. lib. IX fr. 7 habet has lectiones aut supplementa:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Lucius Aemilius et caetera | 9 per unum i in genitivo |
| 2 ii genitivos singulares finire | 10 numeri et versus faciendi nos |
| 3 ut; non ante minorem inse- | Caeli Numeri numerum ut |
| ruit Dousa. | 11 nisi et Caelii et Numerii per |
| 4 nominum omisit Dousa | ii huius Numerii |
| 5 adiecit | 12 in libro quarto |
| 6 vocativum singularem quoque | 13 porro hoc si filiu' Luci ferit |
| 7 ii | collum ut Corneli Cornifici- |
| 8 corripit | que |

Apud codicem duplici ii (versu 2), corrumpi i (v. 6), ad pro ait (v. 10).

D. Marius Victorinus GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10.

cum vero eadem i e litterae iuncta esset, non solum pro longa syllaba accipiebatur, sed nominativum pluralem ita scripta significabat, ut amicei bonei doctei Romanei et similia. at si per solum i scripta esset, eadem genitivum singularem faciebat ut huius amici et cetera. denique omnes qui de orthographia scripserunt de nulla scriptura tam diu quam diu de hac quaerunt, quae per i litteram singularem genitivum et [quae] per ei litteras nominativum pluralem faciat, locuti partim acute, *partim*, ut mihi quidem videtur, inepte, illud etiam ridicule (nam mihi quaedam succurrunt): pilum aiunt militare et vineam, si sit subter quam milites aggerem instituunt, et sicam [et silicem] quae secet per e et i scribenda; at si pilum sit quo pinsitores utuntur, et vinea quae ruri colitur et fistula per i. a quibus libenter quaererem, quo modo scripturi essent aedificii pila, et quo modo singularem discerne-

rent a plurali in his, res dies species, et his similibus. Sam-nitem, licet per omnes casus i longam custodiat, tamen nominativo correpta i *scribite*, ut sanguis pulvis.

E. Terentius Scaurus GL. VII 18, 23 ad 19, 12.

itemque quod Lucilius, ubi i exile est, per se iubet scribi, at ubi plenum est, praeponendum esse e credit his versibus,

mille . . . fiat (358-361).

quam inconstantiam Varro arguens in eundem errorem diversa via delabatur, dicens in plurali quidem numero debere litterae i e praeponi, in singulari vero minime, cum alioqui i non aliud in singulari quam *in plurali, neque aliud in media* quam in extrema syllaba sonet, ut in verbis manifestum est. dicimus enim 'mitto misi misimus', nisi aliam hic vult esse rationem [quod absurdum est], ut, cum verba quoque ex syllabis constent, ex diversa regula corrigantur.

F. Velius Longus GL. VII 55, 27 ad 57, 5.

hic quaeritur etiam an per e et i quaedam debeant scribi secundum consuetudinem graecam. non nulli enim ea quae producerentur sic scripserunt, alii contenti fuerunt huic productioni i longam aut notam dedisse. alii vero, quorum est item Lucilius, varie scriptitaverunt, siquidem in iis quae producerentur alia per i longam, alia per e et i notaverunt, velut differentia quaedam separantes, ut cum diceremus 'viri', si essent plures, per e et i scriberemus, si vero esset unius (*ita Muell. et Lachm.*; unus P) viri, per i notaremus; et Lucilius in nono

iam puerei . . . hoc unius fiet (364-366).

item

hoc illi . . . fiat (369-370).

idemque peila, quibus milites utuntur, per e et i scribenda existimat, at pilam qua pinsitur (pila in qua pinsetur P) per i. hoc mihi videtur supervacaneae esse observationis. nam si omnino in scribendo discernenda casuum numerorumque ambiguitas est, quid faciemus in his nominibus quorum scriptio discrimen non admittit, ut aedes sedes nubes, cum et una et plures eodem modo dicantur et scribantur? quid cum dicimus gestus fluctus portus, cum et genetivus singularis et nominativus et accusativus et vocativus pluralis eodem modo scribantur? quid denique in iis quae ambiguitatem habent inter nomina et verba, *ut* rotas feras? nam tam hae rotae rotas faciunt, quam roto rotas [rotat], et fera feras

et fero feras. sic nec aliter scribitur amor, et ex nomine facit amoris, ex verbo amaris. satis ergo collectum quaedam per e et i non debere scribi, sed tantum per i, cum apud Graecos quoque ex veteri illa consuetudine inveniantur nomina quae per i scribuntur, quamvis producte enuntientur.

G. Cassiodorus GL. VII 206, 21-27, ex L. Caecilio (*sic cd. pro* Caesellio) Vindice.

Luci magni magi cum in genetivis singularibus dicimus, interest quos nominativos habeant: proinde enim intererit, utrum per duo i an per unum debeant scribi. si lucus magnus magus sunt nominativi eorum, unum i in genetivo habebunt: plurali quoque nominativo et vocativo, sed et dativo et ablativo similiter scribentur. si autem Lucius Magnus magius proferantur, duo i in genetivo habebunt, Lucii Magnii magii, quod ipsum Lucilius adnotavit, cum a numero Numerius discerneret.

H. Beda de arte metrica GL. VII 251, 6-10
dicit enim Paulinus

oblectans inopem sensu fructuque peculii
quod si quis dixerit hic eum more antiquorum dactylum in fine
posuisse versiculi, legat quod idem alibi dicit,
excoluit biiugis laquearii et marmore fabri:

251, 16-20

Fortunatus:

Vincentii Hispaniae surgit ab arce decus.
cuius scansio versus par est praefati, nisi forte regulam Lucilii
secuti sunt, qui Lucium (*ita P¹F*, lucilium *P³L et Keil*) et
Aemilium et cetera nomina, quae ante u habent i non solum in
vocativo, sed etiam in genetivo casu per unum i existimat scribi
posse.

F codex Friburgensis 199, nunc Monacensis 6399.

L codex Leidensis bibliothecae publicae 122.

P codex Parisinus Sangercanensis 1189.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

III.—THE CONVENTIONS OF THE PASTORAL ELEGY.

The influence of the Greek and Latin Classics on the literature of Modern Europe is nowhere so definitely illustrated as in the history of pastoral poetry. The haunting melodies of the Greek pastoral and their graceful echoes in the Eclogues of Virgil have exercised a charm so captivating to later poets in this field that not only the general framework of the Classical models, but their very turns of phrase and tricks of style, and even the musical names they give to their rustic characters, have persisted through centuries of pastoral song.¹ I propose in this paper to point out the most striking illustrations of the Classical influence in the conventions which occur most frequently in a single form of the pastoral—the pastoral elegy or dirge, a lament for the death, the absence or the loss of one beloved.

The Greek examples are Theocritus' *Woes of Daphnis*, in the first Idyll, Bion's *Death of Adonis*, and Moschus' *Lament for Bion*; for Latin literature, we have Virgil's fifth and tenth Eclogues.² The publication of the editio princeps of Theocritus in Milan, in 1481, and the Aldine edition, which contained also the elegies of Bion and Moschus, in 1495, started the fashion of singing the loss of kin or friend in musical numbers studiously echoed from the dirges of Theocritus, Bion, Moschus and Virgil. In Italy, the late Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Century saw a surfeit

¹"In Pastoralism, literary tradition penetrates everywhere, like an atmosphere, softening the asperities of innovation and touching the contours even of work fashioned by a Shakespeare or a Milton with a halo of allusion and reminiscence" (C. H. Herford, in Preface to *English Pastorals*). Cf. the illustrative material collected in Professor Mustard's 'Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets', *American Journal of Philology*, XXX 245-283. I am indebted to this article, and more directly to the kindness of Professor Mustard, for valuable suggestions.

²The first eclogue of Nemesianus is an elegy of a sort, but it seems to have played little or no part in the tradition of the pastoral lament. The mediæval lament for Adalhard, Abbot of Corbeil (by Paschasius Radbertus), has recently been discussed by J. H. Hanford, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXV (1910) 427.

of such elegies, composed now in Latin, now in Italian verse.¹ From Italy the fashion spread to Spain, where in the early Sixteenth Century this form was cultivated by Garcilaso de la Vega.²

In France, about the same time (1531) Clément Marot published his masterpiece—a pastoral elegy on the death of Madame Loyse de Savoye, one of the most highly finished and elaborate of the modern dirges. This poem was followed very closely as the model of Spenser's November; and from this time on the pastoral elegy was as popular in England as it had been in Italy.³

Ἦς δ' αἰπόλος . . . αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐφίκει. The distinguishing characteristic of the pastoral elegy is that its subject masquerades as a herdsman moving amid rustic scenes, as, for example, in Matthew Arnold's *Thyrsis*, where the restless temperament and troubled life of his poet friend become in pastoral metaphor:

He loved each simple joy the country yields,
 He loved his mates; but yet he could not keep,
 For that a shadow lour'd on the fields,
 Here with the shepherds and the silly sheep.
 Some life of men unblest
 He knew, which made him droop, and fill'd his head.
 He went; his piping took a troubled sound
 Of storms that rage outside our happy ground;
 He could not wait their passing, he is dead.

¹ I shall limit myself here to the more notable examples, those of Pontano, Sannazaro, Luigi Alamanni and Tasso. Pontano's *Meliseus*, a Latin eclogue in which he laments the death of his wife, is modeled after Virgil's fifth eclogue, but shows acquaintance with Moschus. Sannazaro's *Phyllis*, a lament in Latin for *Carmosina*, is also patterned freely after Virgil, but in the eleventh eclogue of the *Arcadia* he does little more than paraphrase the dirge of Moschus. Alamanni's first two eclogues, laments for his friend Rucellai, are paraphrased respectively from Theocritus' first Idyll and Moschus' Death of Bion. His tenth eclogue imitates closely Bion's dirge. Tasso's *Rogo di Corinna* abounds in echoes from Theocritus, Bion, Moschus and Virgil.

² His first two eclogues contain elegies of the conventional type.

³ Of the many instances of it in English, the following, which I mention in chronological order, are, perhaps, of greatest interest: the pastoral elegies by "A. W.", and by Francis Davison, published in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*; Spenser's *Astrophel*; Thomas Watson, *Meliboeus*; Drayton, *Eclogue IV of the Shepherd's Garland*; William Browne, *A Dirge, and Death of Philarete*; William Drummond, *Damon's Lament, and Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander*; Ben Jonson, *Aeglamour's Lament*; Milton, *Lycidas*; Pope, *Fourth Pastoral*; Ambrose Philips, *Albino*; John Gay, *Friday, or the Dirge*; Shelley, *Adonais*; Matthew Arnold, *Thyrsis*. The tradition is continued freely in Reginald Fanshawe's *Corydon, an Elegy in Memory of Matthew Arnold and Oxford*.

This convention begins with Moschus. In the earliest example, the dirge of Theocritus, the subject of the song is really a herdsman and the dirge of Theocritus is perhaps little more than an idealized version of folk-songs he had heard Sicilian shepherds sing in honor of their rustic hero. The Adonis of Bion's elegy is also a shepherd divinity; but when we come to Moschus, the hero of the song is no longer a shepherd but the poet Bion, whose only connection with the pastoral life is that he wrote verses in the pastoral vein. Moschus adopts the form of Theocritus and Bion, and frankly makes a shepherd of his poet hero. Here we have for the first time, as Chambers¹ puts it, the pastoral form used to "express in poetic metaphor the sorrow of those who loved a singer and a friend. In our own literature it has become traditional for such a purpose. Again and again throughout the centuries

The same sweet cry no circling seas can drown
In melancholy cadence rose to swell
Some dirge of Lycidas or Astrophel,
When lovely souls and pure, before their time,
Into the dusk went down.

Philip Sidney and Edward King, John Keats and Arthur Clough, all alike cut off by an ineluctable fate in the flower of their days; for all alike the cadences of a half forgotten Greek poet have woven their imperishable memorial".

Frame-work of the Elegy. The dirge of Theocritus is preceded by a dramatic introduction. Two herdsmen interchange mutual compliments, and one is induced by flattery and the promise of a gift to sing the "Woes of Daphnis". After the dirge there is further talk, praise of the singer, and at the end a return to the commonplace of present reality. This is essentially the plan of Virgil's fifth eclogue, of the Latin dirges of Pontano and Sannazaro, of Alamanni's first eclogue, of Tasso's *Rogo di Corinna*, first part, of the *Elegies* of Garcilaso de la Vega, of Marot's *Complainte de Madame Loyse de Savoye*, of Spenser's November, of the pastoral elegies of Pope, Philips and Gay. The dirges of Bion and Moschus and Virgil's tenth eclogue lack this dramatic setting, and plunge at once into the theme or approach it by a short prelude or invocation. So, also, a number

¹ English Pastorals, Introduction, p. xliii.

of modern dirges; for example, Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, eleventh eclogue, Alamanni's second eclogue, Milton's *Lycidas*, Shelley's *Adonais*, M. Arnold's *Thyrsis*.

Refrain. A striking feature of the dirge of Theocritus is the refrain:

ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς Μοῖσαι φίλοι, ἄρχετ' αἰοιδᾶς.

Bion also uses it:

αἰάζω τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἠπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις,

and Moschus:

ἄρχετε Σικελικαί, τῷ πένθειος ἄρχετε Μοῖσαι.

The modern dirge employs it often: Sannazaro, *Arcadia*, Ecl. XI, "Ricominciate, Muse, il vostro pianto"; Alamanni, Ecl. I, "Date principio, o Muse, al tristo canto"; Ecl. II, "Piangete sempre homai, Sorelle Tosche"; Ecl. X, "Piangiamo Adon, che'l bello Adone è morto"; Tasso, *Corinna* (closing song), "Piangete, antiche Ninfe"; Garcilaso, Ecl. I (Salicio's song), "Salid sin duelo, lágrimas, corriendo"; Marot, "Chantez, mes vers, chantez"; Spenser, November, "O heavie herse! . . . O carefull verse!"; Milton, *Epitaphium Damonis*, "Ite domum impasti, domino iam non vacat, agni"; Pope, Fourth Pastoral, "Fair Daphne's dead and Beauty is no more"; Third Pastoral, "Resound ye hills, resound my mournful strain".

All Nature Mourns. The appeal to Nature to mourn or the representation of Nature as sharing in the universal sorrow is a commonplace almost never absent from the pastoral dirge. In Theocritus, the mountains and trees mourned for Daphnis. In Bion's elegy, mountains, trees, springs and rivers share in Aphrodite's sorrow for the lost Adonis, and the flowers flush red with pain. So in Moschus, all the flowers withered and the trees cast down their fruit for grief when Bion died. In Virgil's tenth eclogue, "the laurels and the tamarisks wept for Gallus, Mount Maenalus crowned with pines bemoaned him, and the rocks of chill Lycaeus". In the modern dirge this convention is employed often with extreme elaboration. Generally speaking, the ancient poets have "sowed with the hand, the modern, with the sack".¹ The dirge of Pontanus, some two hundred and fifty

¹ Moschus was the first to overdo it and is responsible, largely, for the sins of modern excess.

lines, is made up almost entirely of it,¹ and many later elegies are overcharged with Nature's tears and groans.² Of the saner uses of this "pathetic fallacy" I quote two examples, Spenser, November, who echoes Marot and Moschus:

Ay me! that dreerie Death should strike so mortall stroke,
That can undoe Dame Nature's kindly course;
The faded lockes fall from the loftie oak,
The flouds do gaspe, for dryed is theyr sourse,
And flouds of teares flowe in theyr stead perforce;
The mantled medowes mourne,
Theyr sondry colours tourne.
O heavie herse!
The heavens doe melt in teares without remorse;
O carefull verse!

and Shelley, Adonais:

All he had loved, and moulded into thought,
From shape, and hue, and odour, and sweet sound,
Lamented Adonais. Morning sought
Her eastern watch-tower, and her hair unbound,
Wet with the tears which should adorn the ground,
Dimmed the aerial eyes that kindle day;
Afar the melancholy thunder moaned,
Pale Ocean in unquiet slumber lay,
And the wild Winds flew round, sobbing in their dismay.

Grief made the young Spring wild, and she threw down
Her kindling buds, as if she Autumn were,
Or they dead leaves; since her delight is flown,
For whom should she have waked the sullen year?

¹ I quote a sample:

En squalent prata et sua sunt sine honore salicta,
Extinctamque Ariadnan agri, Ariadnan et ipsae
Cum gemitu referunt silvae, vallesque queruntur.
Extinctamque Ariadnam iterant clamantia saxa,
Et colles iterant Ariadnam, Ariadnan et amnes.

² Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. III, contents himself with a reference to Ovid and Virgil:

te Padus et noster lugubri Mincius ore
cum Nymphis flevere suis, ut Thracius Hebrus
Orphea; te tristes ovium flevere magistri,
ut Daphnim luxisse ferunt; te pascua et agri
undique; et audita est totis querimonia campis.

(The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus, ed. W. P. Mustard, Baltimore, 1911, p. 129.)

In many cases Nature is challenged to reverse her usual course and let confusion reign. This convention begins with Theocritus: "Now bear violets ye brambles, bear violets ye thorns, and let the beautiful narcissus flower on the boughs of the juniper! Let all things with one another be confounded; let the pine tree bear pears since Daphnis is dying; let the stag drag down the hounds, and let owls from the hills vie with nightingales in song". So Pontanus, imitating Virgil's echo of this passage:

*Dira lues coelo ruat, et ruat altus Olympus.
Stragem agris, stragem arboribus, terraeque ruinam
Det super et mediis tellus internatet undis.
Non uxor mihi cara domi.*

Tasso, *Rogo di Corinna*, makes much of it:

*Stelle, stelle crudeli,
Perchè non mi celate il vostro lume,
Poi che il suo m'ascondeste?
Perchè non volgi, o Luna, addietro 'l corso?
Perchè non copre intorno orrido nembo
Il tuo dolce sereno?
Perchè il ciel non si tigne
Tutto di nere macchie e di sanguigne?
Tenebre, o voi che le serene luci
M'ingombraste repente,
Coprite il cielo e i suoi spietati lumi,
E minaccino sol baleni e lampi
D'ardere il mondo e le celesti spere.
Stiasi dolente ascoso il Sol nell' onde;
Tema natura di perpetua notte;
Tremi la terra; ed Aquilone ed Austro
Facciano insieme impetuosa guerra,
Crollando i boschi, e le robuste piante
Svelte a terra spargendo; il mar si gonfi,
E con onde spumanti il lido ingombri;
Volgano i fiumi incontro ai fonti il corso.*

Virgil, *Eclogue V*, complains of the decline of Nature's kindly powers: "Since the fates have reft us of thee (Daphnis), Pales and Apollo have themselves abandoned the fields. In the furrows to which we often entrusted the large barley seed, the accursed darnel and barren wild oats only spring. In place of the soft violet and the purple narcissus, rise the thistle and the

thorn". This passage is echoed again and again. Garcilaso imitates it at some length, Ecl. I :

Despues que nos dejaste nunca pace
En hartura el ganado ya, ni acude
El campo al labrador con mano llena.

La tierra que de buena
Gana nos producía
Flores con que solía
Quitar en solo vellas mil enojos,
Produce agora en cambio estos abrojos,
Ya de rigor de espinas intratable ;
Y yo hago con mis ojos
Crecer llorando el fruto miserable.

Also Tasso, *Corinna* :

Posciache t'involò l'acerba morte,
Pale medesma abbandonò piangendo
Le sue nude campagne, e seco Apollo :
E nei solchi, in cui già fu sparso il grano,
Vi signoreggia l'infelice loglio,
E la sterile avena, o felce appresso
Sventurata che frutto non produce ;
E in vece pur di violetta molle,
Di purpureo narciso e di giacinto,
Il cardo sorge.

And Ambrose Philips, *Albino* :

Since thou delicious youth didst quit the plains,
The ungrateful ground we till with fruitless pains,
In laboured furrows sow the choice of wheat
And over empty sheaves in harvest sweat.
A thin increase our fleecy cattle yield
And thorns and thistles overspread the field.

Ben Jonson, *Aeglamour's Lament*, uses the convention with more originality :

A spring, now she is dead ! of what ? of thorns,
Briars and brambles ? thistles, burs and docks ?
Cold hemlock, yew ? the mandrake or the box ?
These may grow still ; but what can spring beside ?
Did not the whole earth sicken when she died ?
As if there since did fall one drop of dew
But what was wept for her ! or any stock
Did bear a flower, or any branch a bloom,
After her wreath was made.

The beasts of field and forest also show their grief, especially the herds and flocks now left to roam without a shepherd. In Theocritus, the "jackals and the wolves cried for Daphnis; for him even the lion from the forest made lament; his bulls and kine with their young calves bewailed him". In Bion, the hounds of Adonis set up a woeful cry, and in Moschus, the herds of Bion refuse to graze. In Virgil's fifth Eclogue: "No shepherd pastured the herd, after the death of Daphnis, or drove it to the cool stream; no four-footed thing would taste of the river or touch the grassy sward". This becomes an almost universal convention in the later pastoral. For example, Pontanus:

Pastores Ariadnam, Ariadnam armenta querantur
Extinctamque Ariadnan opacis buccula silvis
Cum gemitu testetur;

Spenser, November:

The feeble flocks in field refuse their former foode,
And hang theyr heads as they would learne to weepe;
The beastes in forest wayle as they were woode,
.
.
.
Now she is gone that safely did hem keepe;

Ambrose Philips:

No cattle grazed the field nor drank the flood.
Bleating around him lie his plaintive sheep.¹

The most interesting use of this convention is in Shelley's Adonais:

Oh weep for Adonais! . . . The quick Dreams,
The passion-winged Ministers of thought,
Who were his flocks, whom near the living streams
Of his young spirit he fed, and whom he taught
The love which was its music, wander not, . . .
Wander no more, from kindling brain to brain,
But droop there, whence they sprung; and mourn their lot
Round the cold heart, where, after their sweet pain,
They ne'er will gather strength, or find a home again.

¹Cf. the burlesque in Gay's Friday:

When Blouzelind expired, the wether's bell
Before the drooping flock tolled forth her knell;
The solemn death watch clicked the hour she died,
And shrilling crickets in the chimney cried . . .
The lambkin which her wonted tendance bred
Dropped on the plains that fatal instant dead.

Πῇ ποκ' ἄρ' ἦσθ', ὅκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πῇ ποκα Νύμφαι; The legendary Daphnis of Theocritus is the son of Hermes and a nymph. His childhood was passed among the nymphs, who brought him up. Thyrsis complains that they were not present when Daphnis was dying: "Where were ye, Nymphs, when Daphnis was wasting in death—O, where were ye? In Peneus' beautiful vales or in the vales of Pindus? For surely ye dwelt not by the great river Anapus nor on the watch-tower of Aetna nor by the sacred waters of Acis". This perfectly natural reproach in Theocritus becomes one of the most artificial conventions in the pastoral dirge. Virgil imitates it very closely in the tenth eclogue: "In what woods or glades were ye, Naiad Nymphs, when Gallus was dying of love? For not on Parnassus' slopes did ye linger, nor on the slopes of Pindus, nor by Aonian Aganippe". And so does Luigi Alamanni, Ecl. I:

Ov' eran tutte allor Grazie et Virtuti?
Ove voi, Muse, allor che la chiara alma
Del divin Cosmo al summo ciel sallo?
Non già non già lungo le fresche rive
Del suo chiaro Arno, e non fra i verdi colli
Del suo fiorito nido; anzi lontane
Foste allor sì, che tardo fu'l soccorso
Di tôrre a morte quel cui tanto amaste.

Garcilaso, Ecl. I, imitates more freely:

Inexorable Diosa demandabas
En aquel paso ayuda;
Y tú, rústica Diosa, dónde estabas?
Ibate tanto en perseguir las fieras?

Marot's elegy has a slight echo:

Que faictes vous en ceste forest verte,
Faunes, Sylvains? je croy que dormez là;
Veillez, veillez, pour plorer ceste perte.

Baïf, Ecl. II, Brinon, patterned after Virgil, Ecl. X, has an elaborate imitation, of which I quote the beginning:

Nymphes, quel mont lointain, quelle forest ombreuse,
Quel fleuve, quel rocher, quelle caverne creuse
Vos detint?

This becomes in Spenser's *Astrophel*:

Ah! where were ye this while, his shepherd peares,
To whom alive was nought so deare as hee?
And ye faire mayds, the matches of his yeares,
Which in his grace did boast you most to bee;
Ah! where were ye, when he of you had need.
To stop his wound that wondrously did bleed?

Milton's *Lycidas* studiously echoes the classical models:

✓ Where were ye, Nymphs, when the remorseless deep
Closed o'er the head of your loved *Lycidas*?
For neither were ye playing on the steep
Where your old bards, the famous *Druids*, lie,
Nor on the shaggy top of *Mona* high,
Nor yet where *Deva* spreads her wizard stream.

Also Pope's *Second Pastoral*:

Where stray ye, *Muses*, in what lawn or grove,
While *Corydon* thus pines in hopeless love,
In these fair fields where sacred *Isis* glides
Or else where *Cam* his winding vales divides?

Shelley's rendering is more free:

✓ Where wert thou, mighty Mother, when he lay,
When thy Son lay, pierced by the shaft which flies
In darkness? Where was lorn *Urania*
When *Adonais* died?

ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὧπόλοι ἦνθον. I have already said that the *Daphnis* of *Theocritus* is of divine origin, the son of *Hermes* and a nymph. So *Hermes* naturally comes to *Daphnis* when he is dying, and asks him the cause of his torment. The neat-herds come, and the shepherds; the rustic *Priapus* also comes. All say, "Unhappy *Daphnis*, wherefore dost thou languish"? This also becomes a very artificial formula. *Virgil* imitates it in the tenth *Eclogue*. Shepherds and swineherds, *Menalcas* among them, come to *Gallus* and ask, "Whence this love of yours?" *Apollo* comes and questions, "Gallus, why so mad?" *Silvanus* also comes, and *Pan*; all ask, "Will you ever put bounds to your tears?" *Alamanni*, *Ecl. I*, imitates *Theocritus*:

Discese *Apollo* a noi dal suo *Parnaso*
Et piangendo dicea; deh, miser *Cosmo*,

Dov' or ten vai? Chi di te 'l mondo spoglia?
Pan venne poi con mille altri pastori, etc.

Also Garcilaso, Ecl. II:

Vinieron los pastores de ganados;
Vinieron de los sotos los vaqueros,
Para ser de mi mal de mi informados.
Y todos con los gestos lastimeros
Me preguntaban, quáles habian sido
Los accidentes de mi mal primeros.

Marot has a somewhat fainter echo:

Nymphes et dieux de nuit en grand' destresse
La vindrent veoir.

Baïf, Ecl. II, in the passage beginning:

Tous les Dieux qui des chams ont le soin et la garde
Viennent de toutes pars,

expands the convention into fifty-four lines. Milton, Lycidas, elaborates it into the curiously involved passage beginning:

But now my oat proceeds
And listens to the Herald of the Sea,
That came in Neptune's plea.
He asked the waves, and asked the felon winds,
What hard mishap hath doomed this gentle swain.

More simply, Shelley, Adonais:

and the mountain shepherds came,
Their garlands sere, their magic mantles rent;
The Pilgrim of Eternity, whose fame
Over his living head like heaven is bent,
An early but enduring monument,
Came, veiling all the lightnings of his song
In sorrow. From her wilds Ærne sent
The sweetest lyrist of her saddest wrong,
And love taught grief to fall like music from his tongue.

'Midst others of less note came one frail Form, etc.

"*With fairest flowers . . . I'll sweeten thy sad grave*". The command to deck the bier or the grave of the dead with garlands, or the representation of friends of the dead bringing flowers, occurs frequently. The tradition begins with Bion, where Aphrodite is enjoined to deck the bier of Adonis with flowers and wreaths, *Βάλλε δὲ νιν στεφάνοισι καὶ ἄνθεσι*. In Virgil's fifth

eclogue the singer requests the shepherds to strew the ground with leaves and plant shade-giving trees about Daphnis' tomb:

Spargite humum foliis, inducite fontibus umbras . . .
Et tumulum facite.

Of this there are many brief echoes. For example, Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. III:

Spargite, pastores, tumulum redolentibus herbis;

Castiglione, Alcon:

Vos mecum, o pueri, bene olentes spargite flores,
Narcissum atque rosas et suave rubentem hyacinthum,
Atque umbras hederæ lauroque inducite opacas:
Nec desint casiae permixtaque cinnama amomo,
Excitet ut dulces aspirans ventus odores.

Sannazaro, Phyllis:

tu coniferas ad busta cupressus
Sparge manu et viridi tumulum super integre myrto;

Tasso, Corinna:

Di verdi fronde voi l'arida terra,
O pastori, spargete:
Fate il sepolcro, etc.

Pontano elaborates it somewhat:

Legite intactos et jungite flores
et solis luctum et pueri lachrymantis amorem.
Legite et abscissos Veneris de fronte capillos
Post ubi io Ariadnan io Ariadnan, et ipsum
Implestis clamore nemus, hunc addite honorem
Ad tumulum, pia verba acrem testantia luctum.

Marot turns it into a passage of lingering sweetness:

Portez rameaux parvenuz à croissance;
Laurier, lyerre et lys blancs honorez,
Romarin vert, roses en abondance,
Jaune soucie et bassinetz dorez,
Passeveloux de pourpre colorez,
Lavende franche, oeillets de couleur vive,
Aubepins blancs, aubepins azurez,
Et toutes fleurs de grand' beauté nayve.
Chascune soit d'en porter attentive,
Puis sur la tombe en jetez bien espais,
Et n'oubliez force branches d'olive,
Car elle estoit la bergere de paix.

From the English pastoral I cite two examples, William Drummond, *Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander* :

Fair nymphs, the blushing hyacinth and rose
Spread on the place his relics doth enclose ;
Weave garlands to his memory, and put
Over his hearse, a verse in cypress cut,

and the exquisite flower scene of Milton's *Lycidas* :

And call the vales, and bid them hither cast
Their bells and flowerets of a thousand hues.

To strew the laureate hearse where Lycid lies.

"*The Riddle of this Painful Earth*". There is expressed in almost every dirge, ancient or modern, a feeling of bitter resentment against the cruel fate which blasts life in the bud or cuts it off in the fullness of its flower.¹ Sometimes this is expressed as in the words Bion gives to Aphrodite : "Far thou fliest from me, Adonis. To Acheron thou goest, the loathed and cruel king of death. But I, unhappy, live, for I am a goddess and may not follow thee. Take thou my lord, Persephone, for thou art stronger than I, and all things fair descend to thee". Compare Tasso, *Corinna* :

Oh dolore, oh pietate!
Oh miseria del mondo!
Come passa repente e come fugge
Virtù, grazia, bellezza e leggiadria!

William Drummond, *Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander* :

O death, what treasure in one hour
Hast thou dispersed ; how dost thou devour
What we on earth hold dearest ! All things good,
Too envious Heavens, how blast ye in the bud !

and Shelley, *Adonais* :

For he is gone where all things wise and fair
Descend. Oh dream not that the amorous deep
Will yet restore him to the vital air !

Death feeds on his mute voice, and laughs at our despair.

¹ Andrelinus, *Menalcas* : "invicta resecat mors improba falce".

Lady Pembroke, *Astrophel* : "What cruel hand of cursed foe unknown
Hath cropped the stalk which bore so fair a
flower?"

Milton, *Lycidas* : "Comes the blind Fury with the abhorred
shears".

Sometimes the complaint is against the Heavens which allow such things to be, as in Virgil's fifth eclogue, where Daphnis' mother, clasping the dead body of her son, upbraids the gods and the stars for their cruelty. So Ambrose Philips, in close imitation of Virgil:

The pious mother comes with grief oppress'd :
 Ye trees and conscious fountains can attest
 With what sad accents, and what piercing cries,
 She filled the grove and importuned the skies,
 And every star upbraided with his death,
 When in her widowed arms, devoid of breath,
 She clasped her son.

Oftentimes the melancholy mood born of the sense of bereavement expresses itself in the form of a contrast drawn between the immortality of Nature's life and the mortality of man. "There is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again and that the tender branch will not cease. . . . But man dieth and wasteth away. Yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he?" The earliest instance of this in the pastoral occurs in the splendid lines of Moschus' elegy: "Ah me! the mallows when they fade and perish in the garden, and the green parsley and the fair-flowering tendrils of the anise, they awake to life again and grow, with the coming of another spring. But we, the human kind, the great, the mighty and the wise, when once we die, unheeding in the hollow earth we sleep . . . the long endless, never waking sleep". This contrast is one of the most natural and one of the most effective features of the dirge, and it is not surprising that it becomes one of the most striking conventions of the modern pastoral elegy. Here it occurs first in Sannazaro, *Arcadia*, Ecl. XI:

Ai, ai, seccan le spine, et poi che un poco
 Son state ad ricoprar l'antica forza,
 Ciascuna torna, e nasce al proprio loco;
 Ma noi, poi che una volta il ciel ne sforza,
 Vento, nè sol, nè pioggia, o primavera
 Basta ad tornarne in la terrena scorza.¹

¹ Professor Mustard kindly calls my attention to a passage of Castiglione's *Alcon*, "which will remind the English reader of the splendid passage in *Lycidas* about the Day-star and the ocean bed":

Vomeribus succisa suis moriuntur in arvis
 Gramina: deinde iterum viridi de cespite surgunt:
 Rupta semel non deinde annectunt stamina Parcae.

Alamanni, Ecl. II, also paraphrases Moschus :

Le liete rose, le fresche herbe e verdi,
 Le violette, i fior vermigli e' i persi
 Bene han la vita lor caduca e frale,
 Ma' l'aure dolci, i sol benigni e l'acque
 Rendon gli spirti lor che d'anno in anno
 Tornan piu che mai belli al nuovo aprile,
 Ma (lassi) non virtù, regni, o thesoro
 A noi render porrian quest' alma luce ;

and Tasso, Corinna :

Cade il bianco ligustro, e poi risorge,
 E di nuovo germoglia ;
 E dalle spine ancor purpurea rosa
 Còlta rinasce, e spiega
 L'odoroso suo grembo ai dolci raggi ;
 Spargono i pini e i faggi
 Le frondi a terra, e di lor verde spoglia
 Poi rivestono i rami ;
 Cade e risorge l'amorosa stella ;
 Tu cadesti, Corinna (ahi duro caso !)
 Per non risorger mai.

Marot's treatment of the convention is briefer :

D'où vient cela qu'on veoit l'herbe sechante
 Retourner vive, alors que l'esté vient,
 Et la personne au tumbeau trebuschante
 Tant grande soit, jamais plus ne revient ?

And Spenser, November, improves on Marot :

Whence is it, that the flouret of the field doth fade,
 And lyeth buryed long in Winters bale ;
 Yet, soone as spring his mantle hath displayde,
 It floureth fresh, as it should never fayle ?

Aspice, decedens iam Sol declivis Olympo
 Occidit, et moriens accendit sidera caelo ;
 Sed tamen occiduo cum laverit aequore currus,
 Idem iterum terras orienti luce reviset :
 Ast ubi nigra semel durae nos flumina mortis
 Lavere, et clausa est immitis ianua regni,
 Nulla umquam ad superos ducit via : lumina somnus
 Urget perpetuus tenebrisque involvit amaris.
 Tunc lacrimae incassum, tunc irrita vota precesque
 Funduntur. fert vota Notus lacrimasque precesque.

But thing on earth that is of most availle,
 As virtues braunch and beauties budde,
 Reliven not for any good.
 O heavie herse!¹

The most elaborate form of this commonplace is in Shelley's Adonais:

Ah woe is me! Winter is come and gone,
 The airs and streams renew their joyous tone;
 The ants, the bees, the swallows reappear;
 Fresh leaves and flowers deck the dead Seasons' bier;
 Alas! that all we loved of him should be
 But for our grief, as if it had not been.

In Matthew Arnold's Thyrsis the convention is not so obvious:

He hearkens not! light comer, he is flown!
 What matters it? next year he will return,
 And we shall have him in the sweet spring-days,
 With whitening hedges, and uncrumpling fern,
 And blue-bells trembling by the forest-ways,
 And scent of hay new-mown.
 But Thyrsis never more we swains shall see;
 See him come back, and cut a smoother reed,
 And blow a strain the world at last shall heed—
 For Time, not Corydon, hath conquer'd thee!

"*Peace, peace! he is not dead*". If the pastoral dirge is mainly an expression of despair, it contains also an element of reassurance, of consolation, in the thought that the dead is not really dead but lives on in another world. There is a hint of this in the dirges of Bion² and Moschus,³ though the convention

¹ This convention occurs also in the elegies of "A. W." and Francis Davison, published in Davison's Poetical Rhapsody, where it plays a great part. In Davison's Loss of Astraea's Favour, the contrast is drawn with most elaborate though graceful fulsomeness. The whole elegy is made up of eleven recurring forms of it. In the eclogue entitled Cuddy, ascribed to "A. W.," the contrast is drawn four times. William Drummond employs it in both his elegies.

² *Death of Adonis*, 97, λήγε γόων Κυθήρεια τὸ σήμερον, ἴσχεο κομμῶν. This with Theocritus' change of the refrain toward the end of his elegy to λήγετε βουκολικᾶς Μοῖσαι, ἴτε λήγετ' αἰοιδᾶς no doubt suggested such transitional lines as Spenser's "Cease now, my Muse, now cease thy sorrowes source".

³ At the close of his lament, Moschus imagines his hero as continuing his song in Hades, and suggests that in reward for his sweet piping Persephone may send him back to his native hills—καὶ σὲ Βίαν πέμψει τοῖς ὤρεσιν.

as it recurs in the modern pastoral dates mainly from the fifth eclogue of Virgil. Here the elegy falls into two distinct songs by two shepherds: the first an expression of sorrow, the second of consolation, of gladness even; the first dwelling on Daphnis' death and the pity of it, the second, on his apotheosis, for Daphnis is not dead. He lives on in Olympus among the gods; nay, he is himself a god. This manner of treating the theme lent itself easily to imitation in the Christian pastoral, which regularly closes, as in a funeral service, with the thought of Heaven and the larger life. The transition from despair to reassurance is made either through the song of a second singer who bids the first cease his mournful strain and be comforted with happier thoughts,¹ or, when the dirge is one continuous song, through a sudden change of mood.²

The majority of modern pastoral elegies describe the blessedness of the dead in terms of classical religion and mythology, imitating and echoing Virgil closely,³ or mix Pagan imagery with Christian theology in a curious confusion.⁴ Sannazaro's Phyllis furnishes an illustration, which has the special interest of having influenced Milton:⁵

At tu, sive altum felix colis aethera, seu iam
Elysios inter manes coetusque verendos
Lethaeos sequeris per stagna liquentia pisces,
Seu legis aeternos formoso pollice flores,

Adspice nos, mitisque veni; tu numen aquarum
Semper eris, semper laetum piscantibus omen.

Of the more conventional use of this commonplace, perhaps the finest example is in Marot's elegy, the long passage beginning:

Non, taisez vous c'est assez deploré:
Elle est aux Champs Elisiens receue,

¹ For example, Ambrose Philips:

No more, mistaken Angelot, complain,
Albino lives, and all our tears are vain.

² Milton, *Lycidas*: "Weep no more woeful shepherds, weep no more"
Shelley, *Adonais*: "Peace, peace! he is not dead, he doth not sleep".

³ Tasso, for example, translates Virgil word for word. Pope and Ambrose Philips do little more.

⁴ So Milton, *Lycidas*.

So J. H. Hanford, *op. cit.*, 434.

to which Spenser's vaunted paraphrase

Why wayle we then ? why weary we the Gods with playnts,
As if some evill were to her betight?
She raignes a goddesse now emong the saintes, etc.,¹

is altogether inferior. Shelley's use of the convention is worth all the rest. He turns it freely into a magnificent expression of his Platonizing spirit. Calm philosophy succeeds to bitter despair:

Peace, peace ! he is not dead, he doth not sleep—
He hath awakened from the dream of life—

He has outsoared the shadow of our night ;
Envy and calumny and hate and pain.
And that unrest which men miscall delight,
Can touch him not and torture not again ;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure, and now can never mourn
A heart grown cold, a head grown gray in vain ;
Nor, when the spirit's self has ceased to burn,
With sparkless ashes load an unlamented urn.
He lives, he wakes—'tis Death is dead, not he ;
Mourn not for Adonais.—Thou young Dawn,
Turn all thy dew to splendour, for from thee
The spirit thou lamentest is not gone ;
Ye caverns and ye forests, cease to moan !
Cease, ye faint flowers and fountains, and thou Air,
Which like a mourning veil thy scarf hadst thrown
O'er the abandoned Earth, now leave it bare
Even to the joyous stars which smile on its despair
He is made one with Nature : there is heard
His voice in all her music, from the moan
Of thunder to the song of night's sweet bird ;
He is a presence to be felt and known
In darkness and in light, from herb and stone,
Spreading itself where'er that Power may move
Which has withdrawn his being to its own ;
Which wields the world with never-weary'd love,
Sustains it from beneath, and kindles it above.

¹ The consolation in Gay's travesty is less conventional :

Thus wailed the louts in melancholy strain,
Till bonny Susan sped across the plain,
They seized the lass in apron clean arrayed
And to the ale-house forced the willing maid ;
In ale and kisses they forget their cares,
And Susan Blouzelinda's loss repairs.

In Matthew Arnold, as usual, the convention is less obvious :

To a boon southern country he is fled,
And now in happier air,
Wandering with the great Mother's train divine
(And purer or more subtle soul than thee,
I trow, the mighty Mother doth not see)
Within a folding of the Apennine,

Thou hearest the immortal chants of old !—
Putting his sickle to the perilous grain
In the hot cornfield of the Phrygian king,
For thee the Lityerses-song again
Young Daphnis with his silver voice doth sing ;
Sings his Sicilian fold,
His sheep, his hapless love, his blinded eyes—
And how a call celestial round him rang,
And heavenward from the fountain-brink he sprang,
And all the marvel of the golden skies.

GEORGE NORLIN.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO.

IV.—REPEATED VERSES IN HOMER.

Few of the tests for determining the relative antiquity of the Iliad and the Odyssey have been regarded as more decisive than the test furnished by repeated verses, the so-called Wiederholungen. This has been the subject of numerous investigations and, in spite of the work by Rothe, *Die Bedeutung der Wiederholungen fuer die Homerische Frage* 1890, continues to be a favorite support for the doctrine of modern Chorizontes, as may be seen from two recent works in English, *Monro, Odyssey XII-XXIV* (1901) 327 ff., where a long list of examples is given to show that there are borrowings from the Iliad by the Odyssey, but none of the reverse; *Browne, Handbook of Homeric Study* (1905), p. 101, where discussing the Odyssey the author says, "We have still remaining a fairly decisive criterion of lateness in the borrowing of passages from one position in the poems to another. The borrowings are always found to be from the Iliad to the Odyssey, never vice versa".

It is no criticism on either of these scholars to say that they did not reach these conclusions for themselves, but accepted as true the statements given by Sittl, *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee*, Munich, 1882, and Gemoll, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Ilias und Odyssee*, *Hermes* (1883) XVIII, 34 ff. Although many other works on Homeric repetitions have appeared it will be sufficient for the purposes of this paper to refer to these two only. The literature on this subject is given by Professor Rothe, *Ilias als Dichtung* 1910, pp. 22 ff., with whose arguments and conclusions I am in entire accord.

I hope in this paper to show that the facts have been distorted and that repetitions have in general been omitted whenever they do not seem to lend support to the theory of the Separatists. It would be idle to apply my investigations to the Doloneia or to the last two books of the Iliad, since the answer would be that these books are notoriously late and might well belong to a period subsequent to the oldest parts of the Odyssey, and so accordingly this discussion will be limited to a book at the centre

of the Achilleid, the Patrocleia, or book sixteen. I shall first give the parallels discovered by Sittl and Gemoll, then some that were apparently discovered by neither.

Sittl found four passages or phrases in the Odyssey which he regarded as borrowed from Π. (Under the heading 16 Gesang.)

Π 233 τηλόθι ναίων

vgl. μ 135 τηλόθι ναίειν an derselben Stelle des Hexameters.

In letzterem Verse ist die Verbindung der Infinitive ἀπόκισε ναίειν φυλασσέμεναι unleidlich und wohl auch sonst aus Homer nicht nachzuweisen. No such a difficulty as Sittl supposes exists in the verse in the Odyssey. The note of Ameis-Hentze hints at nothing unusual, "ναίειν ausführender Infinitiv der Folge, aber φυλασσέμεναι Infinit. der Absicht". The passage is not referred to in the Grammar of Monro or the Syntax of Stahl, while Ogden, *De Infinitivi Finalis Constructione*, p. 16, mentions it only in a long list of examples of similar construction. Such a simple combination as τηλόθι ναίω whether as infinitive or participle must have originated long before Homer, so that it was a commonplace in either poem.

The second reference to this book given by Sittl is ;

Π 289; ὁ δ' ἵπτιος ἐν κονίησιν—κάππεσεν οἰμῶξας,
σ 398; αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' οἰμῶξας πέσεν ἵπτιος ἐν κονίησιν.

Ich möchte bezweifeln, dass einer, der an der Hand verletzt wird, zu Boden stürzt, und berufe mich auf den analogen Fall einer Uebertreibung, den Christ in der Ilias aufgedeckt hat.

Homer uses χεῖρ in the sense of arm as well as hand, e. g.

Z 81: πρὶν αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν
φεύγοντας πεσέειν.

A foot-stool might easily strike a person with such force on the arm as to knock him down. It was no hero who was felled thus, but only the cup-bearer, οἶνοχόος.

Sittl's third reference is ;

Π 346; νύξε' τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε,
κ 162; πλῆξα' τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε,

Wenn Erymas von einem Wurfspiesse in den Mund getroffen wird, durchbohrt natürlich der Speer den Schlund und tritt dann hinten heraus. Welche riesige Kraft müsste aber ein Jäger

besitzen, um einen grossen Hirsch mit dem Speere am Rückgrate so zu treffen, dass die Spitze auf der entgegengesetzten Seite—an welchem Punkte, erfahren wir hier nicht—herauskommt. Was den sprachlichen Ausdruck betrifft, so ist *πλῆξα* nur eine schlechtere Lesart für *νύξε*, da Homer jenes Wort nur vom Schwertschlage anwendet. The setting in the Odyssey is as follows: Some god in sympathy for Odysseus causes a stag to meet him face to face, *εἰς ὁδὸν αὐτῆν*; as the stag turned from his course, *ἐκβαίνοντα*, Odysseus thrust him, *πλῆξα*, on the centre of the back right at the spine and the spear went on through. "Through what?" asks Sittl. Most likely through the thing struck, through the stag's spine. However large the stag was, it was not too large for Odysseus to pick it up and carry it on his back to the ship. A man can surely thrust a spear through the spine or the body of a stag which he is able to carry on his shoulders.

Sittl objects to the use of *πλῆξα* on the ground that this word is used exclusively of blows given by a sword. This verb is used of the blows delivered by any instrument held in the hand. Cf. e. g. B 265:

σκήπτρῳ δὲ μετάφρενον ἤδ' ἐκὼ πλῆξεν.

In the present passage Homer is everywhere consistent, Odysseus thrust the stag, *πλῆξα*, and stepping on the body drew the spear from the wound, *ῥέειλ' ἡ*, which is the technical word for a wound made by a thrust and not by a hurled missile. To read into this passage that Odysseus hurled the spear and then find difficulties therein, is to assign to Homer an idea which he denies not only by the setting, since there is no reference to Odysseus coming up to the slain stag, but especially by the specific use both of *πλῆξα* and *ῥέειλ' ἡ*.

The fourth and last parallel mentioned by Sittl is;

Π 775; *μαρναμένων ἀμφ' αὐτόν· ὁ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης
κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.*

ω 39; *μαρνάμενοι περὶ σείο· σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης
κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστί λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.*

In der zweiten Nekyia fehlt die Pointe von *λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων*, Achilles lenkte ja seinen Wagen nicht selber, während Keb- riones in der That *ἵπποσυνάων* ἐν εἰδῶς erscheint. To deny to Achilles this particular skill is to miss the whole tone of the Iliad. The heroes themselves, not their drivers, were the skilled horsemen, and Achilles above all others. When Achilles planned

the races he excused himself from participation on the ground that if he took part there could be no doubt of the outcome;

Ψ 274; εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ ἀεθλεύοιμεν Ἀχαιοί,
ἢ τ' ἂν ἐγὼ τὰ πρῶτα λαβὼν κλισίηνδε φεροίμην·
ἴστε γάρ, ὅσσον ἐμοὶ ἀρετῇ περιβάλλετον ἵπποι.

In the chariot-race which followed the chieftains were the contestants and were called the knights. Cf. the words of Apollo, P 75 ff.: Ἐκτορ, νῦν σὺ μὲν ὧδε θέεις, ἀκίχῃτα διώκων, | ἵππους Αἰακίδαο δαΐφρονος· οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ | ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι δαμήμεναι ἢ δ' ὀχέεσθαι | ἄλλῳ γ' ἢ Ἀχιλῆϊ, κτλ. After the death of Patroclus Achilles returning to battle addressed his horses thus;

T 401; ἄλλως δὲ φράζεσθε σαωσέμεν ἡνιοχῆα κτλ.

Here the driver can be none other than Achilles, but Homer removes any possible doubt in verse 424, after Achilles tells his horse Xanthus he need not foretell his doom, since he has already been warned;

ἢ ῥα καὶ ἐν πρώτοις ἰάχων ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους.

Yet in the face of this we are assured that "Achilles lenkte ja seinen Wagen nicht selber". Throughout the Iliad the drivers are merely subordinate, they hold the whip, yoke up the horses, hold them while the great men fight, but as already said, the skilled horsemen are the heroes themselves.

While Sittl was preparing his investigation Gemoll was independently at work on the same subject, but did not print his results until he had compared them with the published work of Sittl's, so that the production of Gemoll's is both an original contribution and a running comment on the earlier publication.

Gemoll, *Hermes* 1883, 24 ff., found 136 examples of borrowing from one poem by the other; "Mein Resultat ist folgendes: unter den 136 Stellen sind nur drei und zwar in die Ilias später eingeschoben in welchen sich die Odyssee als Original erweist". No one of these three passages is connected with the book now under consideration, the Patrocleia, so they do not require discussion here.

Of the four passages given by Sittl, as already quoted, Gemoll saw traces of imitation from the Iliad to the Odyssey in but one, the last one given, and like Sittl bases his argument on the impropriety of assigning skill in horsemanship to Achilles.

However he gives two other examples of imitation not mentioned in the earlier treatise. P. 71, Auf des Patroklos Bitte: "Wenn du eine *θεοπροπίη* vermeidest und die Mutter dir wohl von Zeus Bescheid brachte, so entsende mich", entgegnet Achill:

Π 50; οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἦντινα οἶδα,
οὔτε τί μοι παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ.

α 409 fragt Eurymachus den Telemach, ob der Fremde (Mentes) eine Botschaft gebracht oder in eigener Noth gekommen sei, und Telemach antwortet:

414; οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίη ἐτι πείθομαι, εἰ ποθεν ἔλθοι,
οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἦντινα μήτηρ . . . ἐξερέηται.

Nach der *θεοπροπίη* war nicht gefragt, und die zweite Frage nach dem Reisezweck des Mentes wird ueberhaupt nicht beantwortet.

Telemachus in his reply wishes to emphasize the certainty he feels that his father cannot return, so he refuses to believe in the two sources of hope or information, namely messages and prophecies. How eagerly Penelope sought for any tidings of her husband is shown by her treatment of the disguised Odysseus and by the words of Eumaeus;

ξ 126; ὃς δέ κ' ἀλγυτέων Ἰθάκης ἐς δῆμον ἵκηται,
ἔλθων ἐς δέσποιναν ἐμὴν ἀπατήλια βάζει
ἢ δ' εὖ δεξαμένη φιλέει καὶ ἑκαστα μεταλλᾷ,

Gemoll's second objection that Telemachus did not answer the question in regard to the purpose of the stranger's visit shows utter lack of poetic comprehension. Eurymachus' questions are:

α 406; ὁππόθεν οὗτος ἀνὴρ· ποίης δ' ἐξ εὐχεται εἶναι
γαίης; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρίς ἄρουρα;
ἦέ τιν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο,
ἢ ἔδν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἰκάνει;

The answers to these questions are:

417; ξείνος δ' οὗτος ἐμὸς πατρώιος ἐκ Τάφου ἐστίν,
Μέντης δ' Ἀγχιάλοιο δαΐφρονος εὐχεται εἶναι
νιός, ἀτὰρ Ταφίοισι φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσει.

Every detail except the last is answered; the name, the land, the parentage, the occupation of the stranger is given, but no poet could have ruined his poem right at the start by

permitting Telemachus to reveal the purpose of the visit as given in 294;

φράζεσθαι δὲ ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
ὅπως κε μνηστῆρας ἐνὶ μεγάροισι τεύσιν
κτείνης ἢ δόλῳ ἢ ἀμφοδόν·

If Telemachus had told this to the suitors, as demanded by Gemoll, there could be no Odyssey such as we now have. Gemoll's other example of borrowing from the Patrocleia is

Π 779; ἦμος δ' ἥελιος μετενίσσεται βουλευτόνδε
καὶ τότε δὴ κτλ.

These words occur also ι 56. No comment is made to show why the Odyssey contains the borrowed passage. In the Iliad this verse causes the greatest difficulty, as it describes a time of day closely akin to

Λ 84; ὄφρα μὲν ἤως ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ κτλ.

Since the time mentioned in the earlier book there have been many hours of fighting, so we are surprised to find that it is still early in the afternoon. In the Odyssey there is no difficulty, the Kikones come early in the day, the Greeks though outnumbered hold them off during the morning and until noon, but finally exhausted in the afternoon they are defeated and flee.

In no passage given by Sittl or by Gemoll is there a cogent reason for assuming any verse of the Patrocleia is copied or borrowed by the Odyssey.

However there are other verses in the Patrocleia similar to verses in the Odyssey, and these Sittl and Gemoll have discreetly omitted.

Π 466; Σαρπηδὼν δ' αὐτοῦ μὲν ἀπήμβροτε δουρὶ φαιινῷ
δεύτερος ὀρμηθεὶς, ὃ δὲ Πήδασον οὐτάσεν ἵππον
ἐγχει δεξιὸν ὤμον· ὃ δ' ἐβραχε θυμὸν αἰσθων,
καὶ δ' ἐπες' ἐν κονίῃσι μακόν, ἀπὸ δ' ἐπτατο θυμός.

Here we have the anomalous use of οὐτάσει in the sense of βάλλω, meaning to wound by hurling, not by a weapon held in the hand. Cf. Lehrs De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis³, p. 52, "βάλλειν non dicitur nisi de hasta vel sagitta vel omnino de missili quod eminus iactatur, itaque distinguitur ab οὐτάσαι, τύψαι, νύξαι, πλῆξαι, quae contra nusquam dicuntur nisi de vulneribus cominus illatis. Is, Didymus, cum librum de Aristarchi editio-

nibus Homeri conscriberet, unum repperit locum, huic vocabulorum usui absonum. Scilicet Π 467 de Sarpedone legitur

ὁ δὲ Πήδασον οὐτάσεν ἵππον,

cum ex antecedente versu pateat Sarpedonem hastam torsisse". Lehrs gives quotations from Aristonicus and Didymus which show that they recognized that here Homeric usage had been violated.

The difficulty, so evident in the Iliad, does not appear in the parallel verses in the Odyssey :

τ 449; ὁ δὲ μιν φθάμενος ἔλασεν σῆς
γονυῖδες ὑπερ, πολλὸν δὲ διήφυνε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι
λακρυφῆς αἵζας, οὐ δ' ὅστέον ἵκετο φρενός.
τὸν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς οὐτ' ἤσε τυχῶν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμων,
καὶ δ' ἔπεισ' ἐν κονίῃσι μακόν, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμὸς.

These verses describe the fight of Odysseus with the wild boar and tell how he received the wound. The boar rushed at Odysseus, tore his leg with his tusk, and in the struggle at close quarters Odysseus thrust him with the spear. They were so near each other that Odysseus could not have hurled the spear but must have held it in his hand. If there be borrowing in these two passages the original can hardly be in doubt. It is remarkable that both Sittl and Gemoll overlooked these long parallel passages.

Π 742; ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἀρνευτήρι ἐοικὼς
κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου, λίπε δ' ὅστέα θυμὸς.

This is the description of the fall of Cebriones when struck by a rock hurled by Patroclus. The Homeric chariot was only a low vehicle, not reaching to the warrior's knee, so that a plunge, or rather a fall, on dry ground from so low a platform gave little occasion for the comparison with a diver, yet this scant occasion is made less by the fact that Cebriones did not go head first, but tumbled over backwards, since the blow was straight in front.

737; βάλε δ' Ἐκτόρος ἡνιοχῆα
ἵππων ἥνι' ἔχοντα, μετώπιον ὀξεί λῆι.
ἀμφοτέρως δ' ὀφρῖς σύνελεν λίθος, κτλ.

The comparison with the diver is found in the Odyssey ;

μ 411; ὁ δ' ἄρα πρυμνῇ ἐνὶ νηὶ
πληῖξε κυβερνήτew κεφαλὴν, σὺν δ' ὅστέ' ἄραξε
πάντ' ἀμυδὺς κεφαλῆς· ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἀρνευτήρι ἐοικὼς
κάππεσ' ἀπ' ἱκριόφιν, λίπε δ' ὅστέα θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ.

This is the description of the plunge made by the helmsman when struck by a bolt from Zeus he was thrown headlong from the deck into the sea. Everything in this passage, the lofty deck, the headlong plunge, the sea itself suggested the comparison with a diver. In the *Odyssey* the simile is original and natural, in the *Iliad* it is forced and unnatural. The passage in the *Iliad* may have been suggested by some previous poem which contained a description similar to the one in the *Odyssey*. It is out of place in the *Patrocleia*, but was dragged in so as to give occasion for the jest that Cebriones might support many by diving for oysters.

If there be original and copy in the use of this simile the *Iliad* surely contains the copy. Oddly enough this evident parallel escaped both Sittl and Gemoll.

Π 548; Τρώας δὲ κατὰ κρήθεν λάβε πένθος,
λ 588; δένδρεα δ' ὑψιπέτγηλα κατὰ κρήθεν χέε καρπόν,

In the *Odyssey* κατὰ κρήθεν is used in its literal sense, the fruit hung or dropped over the head of Tantalus, in the *Iliad* the use is figurative and the original force of the phrase is lost. As the literal use of a word or phrase must precede the transferred or figurative, so the passage in the *Odyssey* is nearer the source of κατὰ κρήθεν than the one in the *Iliad*.

A similar relation exists between the two following:

Π 66; εἰ δὴ κυάνεον Τρώων νέφος ἀμφιβέβηκε
μ 74; οἳ δὲ δ'ὼ σκόπελοι ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἰκάνει
ὄξειή κορυφῇ, νεφέλη δέ μιν ἀμφιβέβηκε
κυανέη.

In the *Odyssey* it is a real, a literal cloud, in the *Iliad* the expression is figurative and derived. Whether one passage in Homer be derived from the other or not, the expression in the *Iliad* presupposes just such a verse as we have in the *Odyssey*.

These few parallel passages, not discussed in previous publications, show how little truth there is in the statement, "The borrowings are always from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey* and never the reverse", and also show how biased the application of this theory has been, since the argument which makes the *Odyssey* dependent on the *Iliad* reverses itself and with equal force makes the *Iliad* dependent on the *Odyssey*. These parallels, taken from a single book, do not prove that the *Odyssey* is older than

the Iliad, but they do show the worthlessness of the investigations conducted by Sittl and Gemoll.

Homer and his predecessors must have had a great store of similes, descriptions, and narratives from which they freely drew; the original passage may be incorporated in many parts of Homer, e. g., the description of a headlong plunge from the deck and the comparison with a diver may well be repeated in the original form in the passage in the Odyssey, quoted above, since a description so natural must have originated long before Homer. This very traditional description may have suggested the comparison with a diver in describing the fall of Cebriones, or, more probably, the poet forced the comparison in order to introduce the sarcastic reference to diving for oysters. However this may be, there can be no doubt that the comparison in the Odyssey is far nearer the original simile, if it be not itself that very original.

A similar explanation applies to all the passages I have quoted.

CONCLUSION.

The repeated verses furnish no indication of the relative antiquity of the Iliad and the Odyssey, a traditional description may fit better now in one poem now in the other, but this does not prove as far as they are mutually concerned imitation or dependence.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

V.—NOTES ON JUVENAL.

3. 13-16.

Nunc sacri fontis nemus ac delubra locantur
Iudaeis quorum cophinus faenumque supellex,
omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis.

The word *mercedem* reminded Mommsen (Sybel's Hist. Zeitschrift 64. 425 f. n. 3) of Vespasian's provision that the Jews should pay a fixed sum to Jupiter Capitolinus for the privilege of worshipping in the synagogues. Hence he assumed that a synagogue was located in the grove of Egeria. Juvenal's words, however, do not readily lend themselves to this interpretation. The money in question was paid, not into the treasury of Jupiter Capitolinus, but to the "people", i. e., into the *aerarium Saturni*. Again, if the money was paid for the privilege of visiting the synagogues, in what sense was it paid by "every tree"? We can scarcely take *omnis arbor* to mean "every (sacred) grove", for the rest of the sentence, as well as the entire passage, refers to one grove specifically—i. e., to that of Egeria. The same phrase makes difficulty for the theory that the Jews made their homes in the grove. Did they actually depend for shelter on the trees instead of on roofs?

The word *mendicat*, too, is suggestive. The Jews did not live in the grove, I think, and they did not visit it to worship: they were there to make a living. We need not, however, insist upon the literal meaning of the verb. The dividing line between modern beggars and the vendors of chewing gum, lead pencils, and shoe strings is very narrow, and the victims usually do not care to distinguish them at all. Probably these Jews were petty tradesmen. The *cophinus*,¹ then, was used to hold their wares,

¹ The current notion that the *cophinus* was characteristic of the Jews rather than of pedlers is as old as the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (Ep. 7. 6. 4). The idea was probably derived from a mistaken understanding of the passage we have before us and of its echo in 6. 542. It is well known that Juvenal was an author familiar to educated men in Sidonius' day. See id. Carm. 9. 269-273, and compare Amm. Marc. 28. 4. 14, and Rut. Nam. 1. 603 f.

and the hay served as a seat. Compare the beggar's mat of 5. 8 and 9. 140.

The reason why tradesmen chose this spot is suggested by Umbricius' purpose in tarrying here. Many carts besides his were undoubtedly loaded and unloaded near the gate during the first ten hours of the day; the spot was analogous to a modern railway station, at least in so far as it furnished a large number of possible buyers with a few moments to spare. Both buyers and sellers would find the shade of the grove agreeable, and so the poet found a tradesman established under every tree.

The *merces*, accordingly, was a license fee paid into the *aerarium* by the Jews for the privilege of selling their wares in the sacred grove. I do not know of any other reference to a license fee paid by tradesmen or by beggars either; but it is probable that the Romans did not totally neglect so obvious a way of collecting revenue from the foreigners in the city.

3. 254 ff.

Scinduntur tunicae sartae modo. Longa coruscat
serraco veniente abies, atque altera pinum
plaustra vehunt, nutant alte populoque minantur.

The editors understand that the accident to the *tunicae* is due to the confusion caused by the approach of the wagons, and so they punctuate with a comma or a colon after *modo*. There is, however, nothing to indicate that Juvenal felt any more connection between these two sentences than between the first of them and the preceding one. In this lively account of a journey through the streets some incidents are recounted at length, others as briefly as possible. Compare the sentence, *Pinguia crura luto*, in line 247, which has no connection with what precedes or follows, and should therefore be set off by periods. We might hesitate to ascribe such unevenness of treatment to another poet, but it is quite in Juvenal's manner (cf. Friedländer, p. 48).

It is not quite clear whose tunics are meant. Perhaps a number of people in the crowd are in the same plight (note the word *populo* two lines below). But in that case it is surprising that every one of the torn garments had been recently mended. It seems better to assume that they belong to the speaker¹ (cf. *mihi*

¹ The use of two tunics by one person was common at all periods. In addition to the passage from Pliny cited in the text, see Plaut. Pseud. 1298, Hor. Sat. 1. 2. 25, Prop. 5. 2. 28.

in line 248). After he has turned his attention from the heavily laden slave and before he catches sight of the huge builders' wagons he has just time to note that he has suffered an accident which Pliny tells us is not uncommon in a crowd (Ep. 4. 16. 2). So he exclaims, "There! I've torn those tunics again!"¹

7. 82-87.

Curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae
Thebaidos, laetam cum fecit Statius urbem
promisitque diem; tanta dulcedine captos
adficit ille animos tantaque libidine volgi
auditur; sed cum fregit subsellia versu,
esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven.

Lewis translates *fregit subsellia* by "has made the benches resound" and compares 1. 13. *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae*, "the columns riven by the eternal reader" (so others, e. g., Weidner). But the emotional tone of the two passages is utterly different. In the first satire Juvenal has quite lost patience with the reciters and we are not surprised at some hyperbole in the account of the damage they do; but here his sympathies are with Statius: he certainly does not mean that the reciter's voice is so loud or his performance so long drawn out as to break the benches.

Another interpretation, which goes back to the fourth or fifth century,² supposes that the auditors became so excited in their applause that they destroyed the furniture. Such an occurrence would be natural enough at a chariot race or a gladiatorial contest or even at a contest between rival poets in case the contestants each had a strong following. It is worth noting, however, that there is no record of damage done by the applause of the spectators at any such contest. It has been reserved for Anglo-Saxon college students, under the excitement of a foot-ball victory, to build a bon-fire in the grand stand. Even with all due allowance for the much maligned Italian temperament, it seems incredible that the mild and rather tedious good taste of Statius' poems should have caused such a commotion. But, to waive this point

¹ Since this note was written, there has appeared in CW. 4. 53 a translation of the passage by Prof. F. S. Dunn, who understands it as I do, although he inadvertently writes "tunic" instead of tunics."

² Scholiast ad loc., as cited by Friedländer. Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. 5. 10. 2, and Martianus Capella, 5. 436, use phrases that seem to reflect the same understanding of Juvenal's expression.

for the moment, is it necessary to impute such shockingly poor manners to the audiences at recitations in the first century? That applause was sometimes carried too far appears from Gellius 5. 1, where Musonius is quoted as saying that the auditors at a lecture on philosophy ought to express their approval quietly, not by shouting and gesticulation. Musonius, however, does not find it necessary to warn them against damaging the furniture. And in the passage before us Juvenal does not show Musonius' condemnatory attitude toward the occurrence he is describing. For once he is not writing in satirical vein; he finds no fault with Statius, and none with his hearers except that they do not pay.

The whole point of the passage is Statius' popularity. He draws such a crowd that their sheer weight breaks down the benches, as modern floors sometimes sink. Suetonius, Tiber. 40, says that on one occasion more than twenty thousand persons lost their lives upon the collapse of an amphitheatre, due, presumably, to overcrowding. That the tiers of seats provided for recitations were liable to similar accidents is shown by Suet. Claud. 41, where we are told of a recitation at which several benches were broken down *obesitate cujusdam*, to the very great confusion of the reader.

7. 126-128.

—atque ipse feroci
bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur
eminus et statua meditatatur proelia lusca.

Mayor understands *lusca* to mean that one eye is closed for the sake of helping the aim. Aside from the difficulty of getting such a meaning out of the word, we should remember that aiming a spear is a very different matter from aiming a gun: there would be no advantage in closing one eye. Friedländer is surely right in assuming that the statue is in need of repairs. Compare the references to broken statues of grandees at the beginning of the eighth satire. I follow Duff in his similar interpretation of *curvatum*; the spear had been bent by accident.

As usual, the poet is not content with a single slur upon his victim. Aemilius has the warlike ambitions of Domitian's Praetorian Praefect, of whom Juvenal says in similar phrase (4. 112):

Fuscus marmorea meditatus proelia villa.

But he hurls his spear *eminus*—here in his own house, at a safe

distance from the foe;¹ and besides it is only the dilapidated statue that is in the fight.

8. 76 f.

Miserum est aliorum incumbere famae,
ne conlapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.

It was quite as impossible in ancient times as it is today for anyone in real life to pull down a roof by leaning against the supporting columns. Juvenal is certainly alluding to some mythical exploit of a man of extraordinary strength.

So far as we know, only two such stories were current in antiquity: Samson's destruction of the temple in Gaza (Judges 16. 29 f.), and the Greek story of Cleomedes of Astypalaea. Cleomedes was deprived of his prize in a boxing contest because he had killed his opponent. Crazy with disappointment he went into the school in his native town and overturned the column which supported the roof. The boys were killed, and Cleomedes had to flee for his life. The story makes its appearance in the extant literature in Plutarch Romulus 28,² but Plutarch refers to it as already familiar.

It is probable that Juvenal knew this Greek legend, but in some respects his lines fit better with the Hebrew story: *columnis* is in the plural; the context distinctly implies disaster to the man who pushes the columns down, whereas Cleomedes seems to have escaped unharmed. There is no difficulty in supposing that the poet had heard the story of Samson. He repeatedly displays a rather extensive though superficial knowledge about the Jews, as, for example, in 14. 96-106. Once, in fact, we seem to have an allusion to the book of Judges. In 6. 546 f. the Jewish fortune-teller is described as

interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos
arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli.

In commenting on the phrase *magna sacerdos arboris*, Duff says that Juvenal "cannot have known of the Hebrew prophetess, Deborah, who judged Israel and 'dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah' (Judges 4. 5)." To the present writer it does not seem impossible at all, especially as the parallelism extends

¹ This understanding of *eminus* was suggested by Professor Knapp.

² See other references in Rohde *Psyche*, p. 167. I am under obligations to Professor David M. Robinson for calling my attention to the tale.

beyond the one phrase. The two lines which we have quoted read like a paraphrase of the Hebrew narrative—"And Deborah a prophetess (*fida internuntia caeli*), the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel (*interpres legum Solymarum*) at that time. And she dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah." The satirist ironically identifies the palsied old fortune-teller with one of the heroines of Jewish legend.

Much as Juvenal disliked the orientals, it is quite obvious that they and their superstitions interested him profoundly. There is nothing strange in an allusion to Jewish legend in a poet who devotes a whole satire to the practices of certain obscure Egyptian fanatics. If, as some have held, the poet visited Egypt, he may have got his knowledge from the Jews of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, is unnecessary. Given the interest in such matters, he could easily have satisfied it without leaving Rome.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

VI.—THE ENDINGS *-ERE* AND *-ERUNT* IN DACTYLIC HEXAMETER.

Both endings of the third person plural of the perfect indicative *-ere* and *-erunt* are used in the hexameter, but are not of equal value in the composition of the verse. The greater frequency of *-ere* indicates a desire to increase the number of dactyls, especially in the fifth foot. In prose, personal preferences are in many instances clearly marked. Wölfflin, *Archiv* 14, 478, cites for the prose of Petronius 13 occurrences of *-ere* while *-erunt* is used 86 times. This is in marked contrast with the poetry where *-ere* is freely used,¹ while *-erunt* is found

127, 5 *albaque de viridi riserunt lilia prato*;
and 128, 7 *mox ubi fugerunt elusam gaudia mentem*.

Verbs with these endings generally have the poetical accent on the penult, although those beginning lines are exceptions as are some occurrences elsewhere:

Lucr. 2, 73 *unde abeunt minuunt, quo venere augmine
donant*;

6, 402 *an simul ac nubes successere, ipse in eas tum*;
6, 508 *multa modis multis convenere undique ad-
aucta*.

Sil. Ital. 15, 352 *haec ubi sedere, ardentēs attollere sese*;
16, 42 *imperfecta. Supercontexere herbida lapsos/
pondera*.

The ending *-ere* occurs most frequently in the fifth foot, somewhat less frequently in the second and third, and occasionally in the fourth and sixth. The *e* is in the arsis of the first in the case

¹ *Cecidere* 109; *emicuere* 127; *fregere* 119, 22 and 123, 187; *incaluere* 123, 189; *intremuere* 124, 271; *maduere* 136; *meruere* 108; *quaesivere* 124, 265; *sonuere* 122, 180; *stupuere* 123, 191; *surripuere* 119, 21; see also *Frag. XXVIII.* 9 invenere*.

of a few trisyllables, and always with elision of the final *e*.¹ In the sixth foot only trisyllabic verbs with short antepenults are admitted, excepting by Lucretius and Catullus. Latin had a very limited supply of such verbs, and after the time of Lucretius only three such words² are used in the hexameter. When the *e* gives the thesis for the second foot, the verb is usually of four or five syllables, though a trisyllable with long antepenult and preceded by a monosyllable gives a spondee at the beginning of the line, as in

Verg. A. 6, 163 *Ut venere, vident indigna morte peremptum*;
Ovid Met. 3, 574 *hunc dixere tamen comitem famulumque*
sacrorum;

Stat. Theb. 1, 645 *Has egere vias. Ego sum, qui caede subegi*.

Sometimes the verb is quadrisyllabic and a dactyl is formed, as in

Verg. A. 1, 130 *nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae*.

The trisyllable is rarely preceded by a dissyllable: Verg. G. 2, 501 *sponte tulere*; A. 11, 186 *more tulere*; Ovid Met. 12, 154 *sacra tulere*; Sil. Ital. 9, 410 *arma fuere*; 13, 656 *ulla fuere*; Lucr. 4, 854 [*nata dedere*].

In the fourth foot the final *e* is elided in about 40% of the occurrences, though there is generally elision in Lucretius and Vergil, and in a majority of the instances in Statius. When the vowel is not elided it is followed in about three-fourths of the passages by *c*, *p* or *s*. Vergil has only *c*: G. 1, 183 *fodere cubilia*; A. 4, 346 *iussere capessere*; A. 6, 274 *posuere cubilia*.

¹ *Coepere* Lucr. 5, 287; Verg. B. 7, 19; Ovid Met. 8, 760; Sil. Ital. 7, 355; *Fecere*: Verg. G. 4, 272; Ovid Met. 14, 638; *Odere* Verg. A. 4, 321; *Videre*: Verg. A. 12, 447; Ovid Met. 11, 305; Val. Flac. 8, 325; and from Silius Italicus *duxere* 16, 551; *iuvare* 7, 390; 14, 274; *sensere* 9, 453; *venere* 3, 265.

² *Dedere*: Lucr. 1, 737; 5, 1110; 5, 1340; Verg. G. 1, 287; 3, 83; 3, 115; 3, 247; 3, 378; 4, 204; A. 1, 398; 2, 243; 2, 566; 3, 238; 3, 337; 3, 566; 9, 292; 9, 686; 10, 488; 11, 190; 12, 696; Ovid Met. 2, 675; 3, 207; 3, 315; 4, 79; 7, 495; 15, 617; Claudian XV. 52; XXIV. 104; XXX. 37. *Fuere* Lucr. 1, 234; 2, 298; 4, 1019; 5, 325; Verg. A. 8, 324; Ovid Met. 8, 711; 10, 75; Lucan 10, 498. Claudian VIII. 334; XX. 242; XXIV. 202; XXVIII. 103. *Tulere* Verg. A. 2, 131; 5, 582; 11, 800; Claudian VIII. 310; XXVI. 391; XXXV. 260. *Dissiluerere* Lucr. 1, 391; *interiere* 3, 937; *procubuerere* 1, 291; *exiluerere* Catullus 62, 8.

Statius has *c* and *s*, while Claudian has *c*, *p* and *s*, one occurrence with *v* XXVIII. 346 *fluxere vaporibus*, and one instance of elision XXVI. 107

semper ab his famae petiere insignia bellis.

Verbs ending in *-erunt* generally have the metrical accent on the penult, though this is sometimes an irrational short, and sometimes it ends the foot, as in

Lucr. 4, 531 *ire foras ubi coeperunt primordia vocum*;

Val. Flac. 4, 374 *flevit Amymone flerunt Messeides undae*.

The ending *-erunt* is excluded from the fifth foot, and occurs but rarely in the third. Most of the writers examined do not admit it at all at this point. It occurs freely in the last foot while more than half the occurrences are in the fourth, giving a spondee at that point, though there may be a dactyl as in Stat. Theb. 11, 673 *horruit instinctu rabido steteruntque tremantes*. Other occurrences of short *e* in the penult are not uncommon, especially in the earlier writers and chiefly when the verb is four or five syllables long. Such penults are found chiefly in the first¹ and second² feet. When the shortened penult is in the third³ foot the verb is generally trisyllabic. In the sixth foot⁴ *-erunt* occurs

¹ *Abstulerunt* Ovid Met. 6, 617; *constiterunt* Lucr. 5, 415; Verg. A. 3, 681; *deciderunt* Lucr. 5, 193; *dididerunt* Lucr. 6, 2; *defuerunt* Ovid Met. 6, 585; Sil. Ital. 14, 207; *desierunt* Lucr. 4, 402; *exciderunt* Stat. Theb. 3, 302; *exci-erunt* Lucr. 4, 37; *inciderunt* Lucr. 6, 1174; *occiderunt* 3, 1028; *pertulerunt* Sil. Ital. 10, 61; *polluerunt* Val. Flac. 4, 457; *prodiderunt* Lucr. 3, 87; *profuerunt* Sil. Ital. 5, 264; *transtulerunt* Lucr. 3, 134; and if not pronounced as a trisyllable *miscuerunt* Verg. G. 2, 129; 3, 283; Sil. Ital. 14, 45.

² *Absciderunt* Stat. Theb. 5, 274; *adnuerunt* Hor. Sat. 1, 10, 45; Sil. Ital. 16, 700; *dederunt* Lucr. 4, 974; 6, 4; *destiterunt* Lucr. 4, 975; *exciderunt* Stat. Theb. 7, 801; *exierunt* Lucr. 6, 120; *fuerunt* Lucr. 5, 474; 5, 677; *institerunt* Lucr. 1, 406; *steterunt* Verg. A. 2, 774; 3, 48; Lucan 4, 771; Stat. Theb. 10, 688; Sil. Ital. 14, 519.

³ *Dederunt* Hor. Ep. 1, 4, 7; *fuerunt* Lucr. 5, 878; *inciderunt* Lucr. 6, 351; *steterunt* Verg. 10, 334; *tulerunt* Verg. B. 4, 61.

⁴ *Dederunt* Ovid Met. 9, 756; 12, 334; Stat. Silv. 4, 1, 45; Sil. Ital. 5, 201; 11, 364; 16, 701. *Fuerunt* Lucr. 1, 467; 4, 1251; 5, 1283; Hor. Sat. 1, 5, 43; Ovid Met. 1, 121; 2, 333; 2, 666; 4, 396; 6, 716; 9, 586; 13, 151; 15, 18; 15, 110; Juv. 8, 254. *Tulerunt* Verg. B. 5, 34; G. 2, 422; 2, 454; A. 1, 605; Hor. Ep. 2, 1, 246; Ovid Met. 7, 501; 11, 661; Lucan 3, 646; 4, 818; 7, 314; Sil. Ital. 9, 590; 11, 523. *Quierunt* Verg. A. 6, 102; 6, 328; 7, 6; 11, 300;

rather more freely than *-ere*, and a larger number of different verbs are used.

	I.		II.		III.		IV.		V.		VI.			
	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt
Lucretius..	1	13	13	16	14	3	7	18	37	10	18	82	68	150
Verg. B....	1	1	1	1	5	10	2	12	9	21
“ G....	1	3	12	1	14	2	7	34	6	2	69	13	82
“ A....	2	2	81	2	64	1	12	18	57	15	6	231	29	260
Lucan.....	9	97	5	137	17	57	100	1	5	352	76	428
Val. Flac. .	1	1	23	55	1	3	21	44	1	126	24	150
Stat. Silv.	1	23	18	4	14	28	4	73	19	92
“ Theb.	6	87	3	66	15	37	104	2	272	48	320
Sil. Ital.....	9	29	36	10	88	25	47	93	10	12	311	98	409
Ovid. Met..	3	18	97	23	63	16	29	118	9	19	306	89	395
Hor. Ep.....	3	7	9	1	2	14	1	30	7	37
“ Sat.....	2	2	6	8	2	7	1	17	11	28
Persius.....	1	2	1	1	3	4	8	4	12
Juvenal	7	4	3	1	1	10	7	1	13	21	34
Claudian	6	59	3	91	11	32	110	10	281	41	322
	18	101	593	73	630	7	114	302	767	61	74	2183	557	2740

The table shows the number of occurrences noticed for the different writers examined, and though not including all that might be included, it indicates sufficiently clearly the general attitude toward the two endings, as well as some of the individual preferences. The shorter ending occurs about four times as

Stat. Theb. 6, 798; Val. Flac. 2, 404; Sil. Ital. 7, 253. *Locarunt* Lucr. 1, 1022; 5, 420; Lucan 6, 413. *Negarunt* Lucan 8, 863; Ovid Met. 3, 574; 13, 131; Sil. Ital. 4, 367; 16, 549. *Probarunt* Ovid Met. 8, 616; Stat. Silv. 5, 1, 69. *Putarunt* Lucr. 1, 635; 1, 705; 1, 708. *Norunt* Stat. Theb. 7, 169; Sil. Ital. 2, 485; 14, 141 (?). *Biberunt* Verg. B. 3, 111. *Flerunt* Stat. Silv. 2, 1, 175. *Impleverunt* Ovid Met. 7, 114. With the exception of *minuerunt* Lucr. 5, 415; *voluerunt* 5, 1347; and perhaps *venerunt* 1, 1077 (see Lachmann ad loc.), other scattering examples end in *-arunt* or *-orunt*. Lucretius has *crearunt* 2, 1155; *imperitarunt* 3, 1028; *nominitarunt* 6, 424; *notarunt* 5, 695; *pararunt* 5, 1011; *rogarunt* 6, 3; Ovid Met. *exhalarunt* 6, 247; *vacarunt* 10, 43; Verg. A. 10, 419 *sacrarunt*; Sil. Ital. *amarunt* 14, 466; *remorunt* 11, 176; and perhaps *morunt* 14, 141.

frequently as the longer, and Lucretius distributes them the most evenly through the verse. He also shortens the penult in *-erunt* the most freely, and with Ovid and Silius Italicus has the largest proportion at the beginning as well as at the end of lines. Claudian has only *-ere* at the end and Vergil prefers it. The satirists, excepting Persius, take a more immediate view than do the epic writers of the events described and have less occasion to use the perfect. There is a difference between the Satires and Epistles in the distribution of the two endings in the second foot, and at this point Lucan also differs from some of the other writers who use the endings about the same number of times.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I—The Verb. By CHARLES E. BENNETT. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, 1910. Pp. xix + 506. \$4.00.

Professor Bennett has discharged a huge task in a manner highly to his own credit and that of American scholarship and has earned the thanks of all students of Latin for the rich array of facts presented, for the criticism to which he has so often subjected the facts and the views of others concerning them, and for the numerous bibliographical hints, even though the latter make no claim to be exhaustive. We are a long step nearer to a real *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*.

The author's purpose was "to prepare a work to replace the now antiquated Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*", published in 1861, 1862. For practical purposes he has chosen 100 B. C. as the lower limit of Early Latin; he holds that, had he extended his work to 75 B. C., only a few citations from the Sullan annalists and from inscriptions would have been added to the material actually used. He forgets the Auctor ad Herennium and Cicero's earliest orations; Lucretius too and Varro might well at times have come within his ken; the former certainly belonged in spirit to an earlier age. On the other hand should the 'Plautine' prologues have been unhesitatingly admitted? Within the limits set he sought to consider all existing remains of any syntactical significance; he has often been obliged to supplement existing monographs, etc., by collections of his own. I fear, however, that his collections are not always as exhaustive as he thinks them to be. Thus, a reference to Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, 4-5, will show that the list of examples of A cum B in the subject with a plural verb (page 3) is not complete; Lindsay again, 4-6, gives phenomena of concord not noted by Professor Bennett. But completeness is not to be expected in a first edition of a book so varied in contents.

According to the Preface, the fragments of the dramatists are quoted from Ribbeck, "other poetic fragments" from Baehrens. What of Vahlen's *Ennius*? (1903) and Marx's *Lucilius* (1904)? The failure to use the best editions is the more unfortunate because the author seldom takes account of variant readings. I wish also that he had printed somewhere a complete list of all the books, monographs, articles, etc., cited by him, with indication of the title or abbreviation by which he intended to refer to each, and that he had used such title or abbreviation consistently.

At present it requires much labor to determine whether a given book or article has been used. Dates of publication are not always given; when given, they are not always right. The addition in all cases of dates and places of publication would have helped in many ways. The Index (489-506) covers over 34 columns, but comes far short of revealing the riches of the book. Thus, for parataxis add references to 120, 166; for potential subjunctive add 63, 147, 159, 180.

The book falls into nine chapters, as follows: I. Agreement, Voices, Impersonal Verbs, Omission of Verb (1-9); II. Tenses of the Indicative [Especially in Principal Clauses] (10-59); III. The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses (60-144); IV. The Subjunctive in Principal Clauses (145-207); V. The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses (208-347); VI. The Imperative (348-365); VII. The Infinitive (366-428); VIII. Participles, Gerund, and Supine, etc. (429-459); IX. The Sentence-Question (460-488).

A reviewer of a book so full of varied riches is necessarily an eclectic. To make a summary of its views is, usually, neither desirable nor necessary; it is primarily a reference book and the student must come to know it at first hand by long continued use. Perforce, then, an eclectic, I have chosen to make for this review a careful study of the first 207 pages (Chapters I-IV; much of Chapter V is conditioned by the views set forth in earlier pages, and the later chapters are at once less intricate and less interesting); further, at the risk of seeming unappreciative of the vast store of good things which the book contains, I have chosen to set down here chiefly the things in which I cannot follow Professor Bennett's guidance. In this way I may, perchance, contribute a little to the study of Early Latin syntax.

It is clear that, to reach the divisions represented by his chapter-headings, the author classified by form (on such classification see Professor Goodell, *A School Grammar of Attic Greek*, viii-x, and Professor Morris's review of Lane's *Latin Grammar*, A. J. P. XX 326). Nowhere, however, does he explain or even indicate his system. Within the chapters the classification is now by form, now by function. Thus, in Chapter III the main divisions are Conditional Sentences, Temporal Clauses . . . Indirect Questions, Causal Clauses . . . Clauses introduced by Local Particles. Subordinate rubrics are Protasis in Present Indicative . . . Substantive *si*-clauses, "Concessive" *si*-clauses . . . *quom-inversum*, etc.

In Chapter IV the main subdivisions are Volitive Uses, Optative Uses, Potential Uses. Under Volitive Uses, the examples of the Jussive Subjunctive fall into two groups, one giving examples in which no introductory particle is present, the other those in which such particle appears.

In the first chapter, in treating concord of verb with two or more subjects, the author seems not to make enough allowance

for word-order, and, at times, for logic. Thus, in Aul. 217 *tu me et ego te qualis sis scio*, though the two subjects precede the verb, the clause *qualis sis* makes the singular *scio* inevitable. So, in § 3, p. 2, it is important to note under (b) that, in three of the four cases in which the verb is said to be attracted to the number of the predicate, the singular predicate intervenes between the plural subject and the singular verb. In the fourth case, Enn. Epicharm. 507, given as *Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi*, Baehrens in fact read *Istic est is Iupiter quem dico* without hint of MS variation; so also Vahlen, Ennius², p. 222, and Spengel, Varro L. L. 5, 65. The list of examples of the "Absolute Use" of transitive verbs (4-5) I should often question. The needed object is frequently in the context. One who reads in the large will note, e. g., in connection with Rud. 178, *ad saxum quo capessit*, that at Rud. 172 we had *horsum se capessit*; the *se* needed in 178 is still before mind, or eye, or ear. Yet Mr. Bennett, unconscious of this, cites 178 before 172, as he cites Cis. 92 *insinuavit* before Cis. 89 *insinuavit se*. In Am. 243 *equites* is object, not subject, of *inducere*. So, on pages 6-7, in the list of passive verbs used as reflexives, there is much room for differences of opinion. But the infinitives in Poen. 219 ff. are surely passive; read 210-216 and 223-229, especially 229. On page 9 the omission of the verb is said to be frequent, but only examples of omitted parts of *sum* are given, and these cannot be exhaustive. See e. g., Brix-Niemeyer Trinummus⁴, on 705, 811, Spengel and Fairclough on And. 120, Lindsay, Syntax of Plautus, 55, 7.

Though Chapter II professes to deal with the tenses of the indicative, "especially in principal clauses", neither here nor elsewhere do the tenses in subordinate clauses receive serious attention. It had been better if this chapter had begun with a general discussion of tense, something comparable to the discussion of the force of the subjunctive, in the first pages of Chapter IV. To our author the present is largely achronistic. This may be, but Most. 949, 950, cited as sure proof, are feeble support; cf. *habitat* there (bis) with *habitavit*, 951, and remember that since 450 the (supposed) contrast between the present and the past of this house has been repeatedly emphasized. No account is taken (11-17) of Lane's distinction between the Present of Vivid Narration and the Annalistic Present, so highly praised by Professor Morgan. The view that the historical present is achronistic, and only "narrates the bare fact of an action which took place in a sphere of time determined as past by the context" (13) seems inconsistent with the (better) view, quoted with approval on page 12, that in using this tense the speaker views occurrences "as if they were going on before his eyes in the sphere of his own present". Again, if the historical present is achronistic, how can it give the effect of greater vividness than the perfect (17)? In discussing passages showing historical

present and perfect together Professor Bennett takes no account of metrical considerations (but on page 57 he employs such considerations); to me they seem important. In 18 ff. many of the examples cited to show that the present has future value seem inappropriate. Thus, in the examples with *abeo* (19), may we not suppose that the speaker, as he uttered the word, was already in motion? Note Professor Bennett's own suggestions at 19. c, d, 20. 4. The treatment of *etiam* in certain questions which to our author have imperative force (25) is poor; so too is the discussion of *etiam* on pages 480-481. Professor Kirk's paper, *Etiam in Plautus and Terence*, A. J. P. XVIII 26-42, is far better; see also my paper, *Notes on Etiam in Plautus*, Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. 41.

From the progressive use of the imperfect Professor Bennett derives the customary and iterative uses (26); why then must the customary use of the present come from the aoristic use of the present (11)? In Epid. 99 *ante hac . . . solebas dare*, he makes *solebas* aoristic; "it is illogical to speak of a custom being customary" (31). But on page 157 he declares that the phenomena of language are not logical, but psychological and sociological. Aside from that, the important word here is not *solebas*, but *dare* colored by *solebas*; the speaker is seeking to bring out customariness better than could be done by *dabas. eram, eras*, etc., our author makes usually aoristic, not customary imperfect, because he can see no notion of continued action (34; the italics are mine) here; but why not see continued *state* or *condition*? (cf. 29-30). In As. 927, *modo, quom dicta in me ingerebas, odium, non uxor, eram*, cited as sure proof that *eram* is aoristic, because "the idea corresponding to a 'wasn't being' seems very inappropriate", both clauses are progressive, and the second clause is not really negative; the sense is *odium potius quam uxor eram*. My remarks in *The Classical Weekly* 2. 185, 3. 49 on the right interpretation of *non* in supposed cases of *ut non = ne* in final clauses will be found to apply here.

In the examples of the volitive future indicative in commands (39. c), I see a "familiar imperative" (Gildersleeve, A. J. P. XVIII 121) and, commonly, a peremptory tone (not so Professor Bennett). To me this future expresses, properly, a prediction; since no one can predict another's conduct unless he controls that other, we readily get the tone commonly present in this use. To Professor Bennett *ita me amabit Iuppiter* is optative, and there is no difference between this phrase and *ita me Iuppiter amet*; to me the former is prediction (predicted blessing), the latter a prayer. I agree then with Sjögren. In Pers. 16, *To. di ament te. SAG. O Toxile, dabunt di quae exoptes*, regarded by Professor Bennett as decisive for his view, the shift from subjunctive to indicative may well be due to the second speaker's desire to cap the word of the first (predicted blessings are, at least linguistically, better than blessings prayed for). Note the

emotional O Toxile, and cf. the fine courtesy of Plesidippus's words, interpreted by my explanation, in Rud. 107 DÆ. Virile sexus numquam ullum habui. PL. At di dabunt ('that will come by the gods' good grace').

The perfect is said to = a future, e. g., in M. G. *disperiistis*, nisi mulcassitis, Am. 428 *victus sum si dixeris* (46). Why, then, are *perii*, *occidi*, etc., described (45) as examples of the present perfect denoting "the continued state resulting from a completed act". Strange language this! At the least it should run "from an act completed in fact or in imagination". Does Hannibal's *vicinus* in Livy 21. 43. 2 refer to the future? To the category, rightly explained, belong examples not noted by our author; e. g., Men. 225 *cocta sunt* (contrast 326); M. G. 185 *dixi* (read in the light of 182-184). Instructive in another tense-sphere are Ps. 892 *quin tu is accubitus . . . corrumpitur iam cena*, and Rud. 304 *nisi quid . . . capsimus, incenati sumus* (= *cenavimus*).

The statement (46) that in *potuit* + the infinitive we have "the use of the perfect indicative as the equivalent of the pluperfect subjunctive" seems most unfortunate; *potuit reperire* and *potuisset reperire* are different things. On page 36, writing about the 'shifted imperfect' the author speaks more wisely. On page 52, again (under *satis fuerat*, etc.) he is also more careful.

If the pluperfect did not originally represent an act (state) as prior to another past act (state), and if this is the most frequent use of the tense in Early Latin (47; 50), division 1 (48) and division 3 (50) should change places. In Plautus and Terence, however, to one who reads in the large the pluperfect often, I think, has the force commonly assigned to the tense. In 53. 6, since *sisto* is properly a transitive verb (ἵστημι rather than *sto*), the pluperfect does not in Ps. 913a, *ubi restiteras*, and Catulus, Baehrens, p. 276, *Constiteram . . . salutans*, denote the state resulting from a completed past act.

In Chapter III conditional sentences are first considered. The earliest conditional period, it is said, consisted simply of two paratactic indicatives (to the few examples of this we may, perhaps, add Heaut. 78-79, taking *rectumst* and *non est* as 'protases', and punctuating with a question mark, as we can in some of our author's examples). But parataxis has not yet been defined, nor is it here defined; neither here nor at 208-209 is this all-important subject adequately treated, at least for ordinary mortals.

Conditional sentences are classified at first by the tense of the protasis; within the groups thus fixed the sub-divisions are determined by the form of the apodosis. There is no comment on the value of the protasis, and no names are used. This is, in effect, the system introduced by Lane's Latin Grammar and so heartily approved by Professor Morris, A. J. P. XX 327-328.

On page 73 the author sees "pronounced temporal force" in *si*, in Hec. 181 *si quando ad eam accesserat*, *fugere*, and Cato,

Frag. Jord. 35. 3 *si quis strenue fecerat, donabam*. But in Terence the temporal force is due to *quando*; in Cato there is no temporal force, unless there is temporal force in *quicumque* in such a clause as *quicumque strenue fecerat*. An excellent paragraph is c, p. 77, giving examples in which one protasis is qualified, <restated, or amplified> by another; add, perhaps, Phorm. 13-15.

On pages 77-78 substantive *si*-clauses appear. But I doubt the propriety of saying that in Mil. 1326, *nil miror si lubenter hic eras*, the *si*-clause is substantive, or of saying that in Cato, Frag. Jord. 25. 5 *idne irascimini si quis superbior est quam vos?* the *si*-clause is appositive to *id*. In Phorm. 1040 f. the effect is surely far better if we take the *si*-clause as truly conditional (adverbial). Is *nil miror si haec fecisti* exactly the same as *nil miror te haec fecisse*? Further, I regard as most unfortunate the growing tendency (seen often in this book) to describe as substantival all sorts of clauses that are properly adverbial. See Professor Morris's good words, A. J. P. XX 326, concerning Lane's treatment of certain final and consecutive clauses (though he seems to have overlooked Lane 1948). This tendency is no aid to the right understanding of Latin syntax; rather does it sorely befog students.

In the account of temporal *quom*-clauses (79 ff.) I miss a reference to Professor Hale's elaborate study of *cum*. If Poen. 924 *nunc est quom me commoror* is rightly classed (79) as an example of the descriptive *quom*-clause, I should put here Cap. 516 *nunc illud est quom . . . nimio mavelim*, a passage I used (see The Classical Review 14 [1900]. 216) in an attempt to explain *nunc quom maxume*, seen in Terence (see Spengel on And. 823) and in Cicero C. M. 38; cf. Plautus's *nimio* with the *maxume* of the idiom. On page 86 it is stated, to my mind wrongly, that *quom magis* = *quo magis*, e. g., in Pers. 564 *quom magis contemplo, magis placet*. If *quom* is ever temporal, it is temporal here. See also Professor Fay on Most. 702. On page 85 one of four examples of "Substantive *quom*-clauses" is Cas. 39 *abhinc annos factum est XVI quom conspicatust . . . puellam exponi*. Substitute here *Anni XVI sunt quom*, etc., and this example is exactly like that in the next paragraph, which illustrates *quom*, 'since' ('seitdem').

On page 98, Professor Bennett interprets Bacch. 737 *Mane dum scribit* as 'wait till he writes', not as 'wait while he is writing'. The view in Hale-Buck 571 is not noted. To me *dum* in these passages means 'while' (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge 571, 228, page 157). In his Lexicon Plautinum, s. v. *Dum* 3, page 440, Professor Lodge interprets by "*ἐν* φ, sed vergit ad significationem 'donec'".—Hanc autem rem quisnam diiudicabit?

Professor Bennett finds (101) only two examples of *postquam* with imperfect indicative (Schmalz⁴, page 550. finds only one, Most. 640). One, Most. 647 (640), Professors Sonnenschein and Fay leave without comment in their editions. But Phorm. 569,

postquam videt me eius mater esse hic diutius, simul autem non manebat aetas virginis meam negligentiam, . . . ad me profectam esse aibant, though taken by others as it is by our author, is not germane; at the least it is not a clear case, for the *simul autem* clause may surely be regarded as parenthetical, grammatically, and may be set off by dashes. In Most. 647 may we see the use of *postquam* with imperfect which became so common later in Livy? see Gildersleeve-Lodge 562. *Postquam* with pluperfect indicative is not common (102); it may be added that the restriction that marks this use later (G.-L. 563. 2) does not appear in Professor Bennett's examples.

In the discussion of clauses introduced by *antequam* and *priusquam* more use might have been made of Professor Hullihen's treatise on these conjunctions (to which a mere blanket reference is made at 104, note), especially on page 106, in connection with the remark that in 16 out of 18 examples of *priusquam* with the future perfect indicative the main clause is negative. So far as I know, to Professor Hullihen belongs the credit of having first observed the important part which the presence of the negative in the main clause plays in the *antequam* and *priusquam* constructions. For a convenient summary of his views see The Classical Weekly 4. 194-196, 203-205.

The indicative in indirect questions (viewed as the original use, arising out of parataxis: 120) is well discussed. In Cap. 206a, however, *scimus nos nostrum officium quod est* (listed with questions introduced by *quis*), our author overlooks *quod*; we have here no question but a relative clause and grammatical prolepsis. In this list Professor Bennett does not note how often the indicative in 'indirect' questions occurs in connection with an imperative (he notes this later, in other groups); it is, of course, precisely here that one could hesitate longest in (English as in) Latin between independent and dependent questions (and ejaculations).

The lists on pages 123-132 show well how much more frequent *quia* is than *quod* in causal clauses in Early Latin. But I find here no discussion of the difference (or lack of difference) of meaning, or of the classes of verbs used in the main clause (comment of this kind does occur in the discussion of *quom*-causal clauses, 133, bottom). The reader must determine for himself whether the examples bear out what is commonly said on these points (at least for later times).

On page 131 examples of *nisi quia* are given. It is then said that *nisi* alone sometimes = *nisi quia*, e. g., in Cist. 676 *ubi ea sit nescio, nisi . . . loca haec circiter mi excidit*, Rud. 750 *nescio, nisi scio probiorem hanc esse quam te*. This explanation is better than that often given, that *nisi* here is adversative,¹ but I

¹ So even Schmalz⁴, p. 589, citing Lindskog. Schmalz talks also as if the construction were commoner than Professor Bennett's examples indicate; he says, too, it is commoner in Terence than in Plautus; our author's examples give the opposite result.

do not think it right. There is to me no ellipsis here of *quia* and no adversative force. Nearly all the examples show *nescio nisi*. I once heard a Vermont farmer beg his son to use care in getting some pigs back into their pen; in true Plautine-Terentian fashion he cried, "You can't drive them unless you can coax them". He meant, "You can't do anything with them unless you can coax them". In a word he had in mind as his main verb rather a universal negation such as *nescio* in our Latin examples. This explanation, which I worked out independently years ago, I find now in Lindskog ap. Schmalz⁴, p. 589.

Chapter IV begins with an excellent discussion (146-161) of the force(s) of the Latin subjunctive. The history of opinion concerning the fundamental values of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative and the basic values of the Latin subjunctive is given briefly but well. The author agrees with Delbrück (154), that the Indo-European subjunctive expressed volition and futurity, the Indo-European optative wish and potentiality. He notes (155) that Delbrück, in saying this, is not concerned with the "question of the absolutely original values of the subjunctive and optative". The relationship of the functions of the two moods—a very different matter, says the author—is now considered. Here again he agrees with Delbrück, but hesitatingly; he regards this question as far less important than the question "as to the existence of the uses themselves and as to their Indo-European character" (161). On the unimportance of "Indo-European character" as an *explanation* of phenomena see Professor Morris, A. J. P. XVIII 401. He sums up thus (160-161): "I agree with Delbrück in his recognition of fundamental uses; volitive and future for the Indo-European subjunctive; wishing and potential for the Indo-European optative. These potential uses are the 'may' and 'should'-'would' potentials. To them jointly I have elsewhere given the name of 'contingent futurity', a designation which I shall employ also in my subsequent discussion of the potential uses of the Latin subjunctive. The Deliberative I regard with Brugmann as also Indo-European, but I consider it a volitive development and shall treat it as such". The system of the present book, then, is essentially that of the author's Latin Grammar (with Appendix), published in 1894.

Surely such terms as 'may' potential, 'should'-'would' potential cannot be regarded as happy. When a Roman wished to say 'can', 'could', in any sense in which these words are naturally understood by English-speaking persons, he used the right form of *possum*. Even Professor Bennett's caution (206), that he uses 'could' in the sense of German *konnte*, in *Man konnte sehen*, will not protect all of his readers. An even worse use of 'can', it seems to me, occurs on page 178, in the elaborate discussion of the deliberative subjunctive; there Eun. 822 *quid tibi ego dicam misera?* is rendered by 'dear me! what can I say!' and is explained as "implying that the speaker is in a condition

where the proposed action is hopelessly impossible".¹ This seems a case of wrong translation, followed by a category due to the laying of too much stress on the translation. By a similar process Professor Hale easily discovered An Unrecognized Construction of the Latin Subjunctive; The Second Person Singular in Statements of Fact (see *Classical Philology* 1. 21 ff.). If the term potential is to be retained, it would be better to retain it only in connection with such an absolutely impeccable statement as Professor Bennett himself gives, on page 197, under the caption "The 'Should'-'Would' Potential". I would he had written only that on the subject.

The classification and discussion of independent uses of the subjunctive begins with the consideration of volitive uses (161-191). The jussive subjunctive has the right of way (162-166). In *ut* as used with the jussive subjunctive Professor Bennett sees an indefinite *ut*, corresponding to the indefinite use of the adverb *qui* (165-166). The jussive subjunctive in perfect tense is rare; there is no difference, he thinks, between the present jussive and the perfect jussive in force. Thus early the author has in mind Professor Elmer's views concerning the Latin Prohibitive. The affirmative hortatory subjunctive is common, the negative is not (of the latter only four examples are given, 167). Here Plautus has *ne*, Scipio *non*, Ennius *nec* . . . *non*. On page 167 we read: "While *ne* (*neve*) were volitive negatives, yet *non* and *neque* were always possible at every period of the language". Again, we read (168), that in prohibitions, in both present and perfect subjunctive, *non*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *numquam* occur (see 170, 171); from 172-173 it appears that *neque* (*nec*) occurs 26 times as connective in prohibitions, *neve* (*neu*) only 10 times. "Barring Poen. 29, *neve* is used only when the preceding clause is prohibitive, and even then *neque* may be used (Seyffert, Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 63, p. 37)". These facts are brought together on page 173 to disprove Professor Elmer's argument, A. J. P. XV 299 ff., that *ne* is the only possible negative with the prohibitive subjunctive, and that the forms with *non*, etc., show rather subjunctives of obligation or propriety developed out of the potential subjunctive. The possibility of such potential origin, says our author, was not made clear by Professor Elmer; surely it is as clear as the development of *ἄλθους* *ἄν* into a quasi-command recognized by so good an authority as Jebb, on Antig. 444. The frequency of *non* with prohibitions in Early Latin throws interesting light on the frequency of this use in Silver Latin. But I think Professor Bennett's treatment of *neque* and *neve* in these connections inadequate; see my note in *The Classical Weekly* 2. 169, and Lease, *Classical Philology* 3. 302 ff.

Professor Bennett agrees with Professor Elmer that Madvig's distinction between the second singular present subjunctive and

¹ Professor Bennett overlooks, I fear, *tibi*; he overlooks also the triple appeal in 817-821 to Pythias for speech; he overlooks, finally, the fact that the important word here is *quid*: 'What would you have me say?'

the second singular perfect subjunctive in prohibitions (set forth in all American grammars, I think, till the appearance of Professor Elmer's papers in 1894, set forth in none published or revised since that year) will not hold. But he refuses to believe, with Professor Elmer, that the perfect is used where there is special emotion; this view, he thinks, is subjective, and has met with little favor and much criticism. True to his conception of the present tense as largely aoristic, he thinks (against Delbrück) that the present prohibitive is often aoristic and that it does not represent the act as in process.

The discussion of that difficult theme, the deliberative subjunctive (178-186), is not as clear and satisfactory as it might be. His caption is (p. 178), The "Deliberative" Subjunctive. He differentiates four types, which are "seldom differentiated" but "usually . . . all brought roughly under the one head of the 'Deliberative'". These are: (a) Subjunctive of Inquiry after a Command or Advice; (b) Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness; (c) True Deliberatives; (d) Subjunctive of Impossibility or Helplessness. The juxtaposition here of "Deliberative" and "True Deliberative" will not help younger (or older) students. Nor will the confusion be relieved when one reads (179) that the Subjunctive of Inquiry after Command or Advice "seems to be the original type of the four categories above mentioned". Why then is it not True Deliberative? Further, I regard the division into four classes as of less consequence than the observation that these four types, "seldom differentiated", are indeed held together by a common bond, in the fact that the speaker is always inquiring after a command or after advice; he always throws himself on some one else, whether that other is actually present in the flesh or no more ready and competent to help *praesens* than are the earth and sea and sky, to which, in Greek tragedy, appeal is made on similar occasions. To me the examples under (a) and (b) lie too close together to be separated; in all of them the speaker recognizes, in greater or less degree, "the superior authority, wisdom or judgment of the person addressed"; in both sets of examples we often have a preceding imperative, uttered by another speaker. The term True Deliberative Professor Bennett restricts (184) to examples in which "the speaker is represented as actually deliberating with himself as to what course of action he shall pursue". The distinction I made above holds here; the speaker is appealing to a helper or adviser not present in the flesh or, if you will, to himself, in soliloquy, as Professor Morris holds. For self conceived of as another self compare such phrases as *mihi conscius sum*, ἐμᾶντῳ σύννοια. This type is manifestly a later and sophisticated type; hence we have another argument against giving the title true deliberative to this rather than to type (a). Concerning the Subjunctive of Helplessness I have said a word above; it stands to type (c) much as the 'Ethical Dative' stands to the 'Dative of Reference'.

The suggestion made (e. g. by Delbrück, Elmer) that some of the questions under (b) are potential our author rejects (180). But he regards As. 724 "*quid exoptem?*" as one of the few cases in Early Latin where a potential character could be easily defended". Why should not account be taken of the possibility that the subjunctive in these questions, following as they do an imperative giving another's utterances, is due to Oratio Obliqua? This oratio obliqua possibility is not considered in the discussion of the Repudiating Question (186 ff.), which is to Professor Bennett deliberative, but it is to me very strongly suggested by the examples on page 187, in the paragraph labeled Illustrations of Origin; there we have an imperative preceding the repudiating question. This view was set forth by Professor Fay in The Classical Review 11. 345 ff.; see also The Classical Quarterly 5. 185 (July, 1911). To Professor Bennett the subjunctive of repudiating question is the subjunctive of inquiry after a command, "but the indignant attitude of the speaker develops a repudiating force" (186). If this is so, why doubt, as our author does (189), concerning the nature of the *-ne* with such questions? It must be interrogative. In The Classical Quarterly 5. 185 Professor Fay, on the principle that "psychological opposites take the same construction", now explains the repudiating question as "a clear opposite to the concessive". He thus agrees with Professor Bennett in making the construction fundamentally volitive, and must take *-ne* as interrogative. But Professor Bennett (178) finds but a single example of the jussive subjunctive used as concessive. On pages 198-199 Professor Bennett makes the subjunctive in *adeas velim* and the like potential, rejecting Professor Morris's theory (A. J. P. XVIII. 139, 284 ff.) that the subjunctive is really due to attraction by parataxis from the mood of the other verb. I agree rather with Professor Morris. One advantage of his theory is that it applies equally well to such forms as *patrem atque matrem viverent vellem tibi* (A. J. P. XVIII 159). The theory that the mood in *vellem* is potential leads to difficulties (that Professor Bennett cannot solve: 203); one is that on this theory the reference should be to past time, whereas in fact the reference is regularly to the present. The theory that *vellem dicere possem* is written because the speaker has in mind, as his real thought, *utinam dicere possem*, seems to me an easy explanation.

One great merit of Professor Bennett's book is that it will stimulate discussion and lead to renewed investigation, not merely of the facts but of their explanation. His book shows that phenomena whose frequency might be taken for granted are in fact rare, and that many matters not deemed worthy of comment by editors deserve careful consideration. To have laid a solid foundation for work in a great field is distinction enough for any one, however much his results may be questioned in detail.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui Supersunt. Recensuit Rhythmicæque Distinxit CAROLUS U. CLARK adiuvantibus Ludovico Traube et Guilelmo Heraeo. Vol. I, libri XIV-XXV, accedunt Tabulae Quinque. Berolini, apud Weidmannos, MDCCCX, 25 + 387 pp., 16 Marks.

This sumptuous critical edition deserves a warm welcome. It is not only an excellent piece of work in itself, but now that Gardthausen's text has disappeared from the Teubner series, it is our only modern edition of one of the most important and interesting authors in the later history of the Empire. Ammianus was a man of deeds as well as a man of words. Occasional glimpses of his personality, a passing reference here and there to his own experiences or to events in which he himself took an active part suggest a man whose life, if we had it before us, would read like a novel of adventure. Even his style in itself, with its inequalities and incongruities, its jostling of the old and new, the high and low, the foreign and native, is curiously suggestive of the age in which he lived, those times of upheaval, stress, and turmoil—moral, political, and social—which accompanied the decay and disintegration of the ancient world.

The edition is to consist of two volumes. The first, which is now before us, contains a praefatio (XI pp.), books XII-XXV of the text, and five pages in facsimile of important MSS. The second volume is already in press. It will contain the remainder of the text (books XXVI-XXXI), a more detailed discussion of the textual tradition, etc., and notes. Readers of the Journal will also be glad to learn that the editor intends to add a list of imitations and a complete index verborum. In view of Ammianus' unique relation to his predecessors and of his stylistic importance, these two indices will be sufficient in themselves to give Professor Clark's edition a real and permanent value.

The more we investigate the work of this author, and the more we know of the language and literary art of his time, the more clearly do we recognize and appreciate the magnitude of the task which Professor Clark has set before him. Those, however, who are familiar with his Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus (New Haven, 1904) have already formed a high opinion of his ability and training as a textual critic.

The arrangement of the apparatus criticus—a matter of unusual difficulty in this particular author—is sufficiently set forth in the praefatio, and is as clear and simple as circumstances will permit. Beside the usual acknowledgements and explanations there is also a brief survey of the textual tradition illustrated by a stemma codicum. A discussion, however, of these questions, even if it were possible in this brief notice, really ought to be deferred, as the editor himself suggests, until

the completion of his work. In the meantime, therefore, I content myself with a brief reference to that feature of the book which is described on the title-page by the phrase 'rhythmicæ distinctit'.

Nowadays, of course, no good scholar is unaware of the part played by the rhythmical clausula in the cultivated prose of all languages. The Greeks, however, and after them the Romans, have surpassed all others in their national consciousness of its existence and in their study of its possibilities and limitations. Hence, as students of Meyer's *Ludus de Antichristo*, of Zieliński's *Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* (A. J. P. XXV. 453), etc., are quite aware, a knowledge of the rhythmical clausulae of Latin prose is of special value, not only as a criterion of period, of style, and of schools of oratory, but also of pronunciation and occasionally even of textual tradition.

The laws of the cursus as we find it in Ammianus are comparatively simple. The main rule is that the last two accents of the phrase must be separated from each other by either two or four syllables, never by three or one. The intervening syllables may be either long or short. It is interesting to observe that final vowels are never elided and that *u* and *i* may be treated either as vowels or as consonants. Note, too, that Greek words here retain their native accent. Exceptions are very rare. Clark illustrates by the following examples, arranged under the three types 'planus', 'tardus', 'velox'. The adjective in each case is meant to describe the specific rhetorical effect of the type to which it is applied.

Cursus planus :	expeditiōnis euēntus	XIV, 1, 1
	illūc transitūrus	XIV, 6, 16
	Aēgyptum pétens	XXII, 5, 7
	régna Persídis	XXIII, 5, 16
cursus tardus :	pártium ánimis	XIV, 1, 1
	instruménta non léuia	XIV, 6, 18
cursus velox :	frégerat et labórum	XIV, 1, 1
	relatúri quae audírent	XIV, 1, 6
	obiécti sunt praeter mórem	XIV, 2, 2
	Aēgypto trucidátur	XIV, 11, 32
	gramínea prope ríuum	XXIV, 8, 7
	nómine adlocútus est	XV, 6, 3
	incénsas et habitácula	XVIII, 2, 19

The use of the cursus as a criterion of punctuation, though new in our times, is, of course, not the invention of Professor Clark. We find it, for instance, in such recent editions of Latin authors as Stricker's text of *Hrotswitha* (1906) and Ziegler's *Maternus, De Errore Profanarum Religionum* (1909). Stricker and Ziegler, however, use special marks (short vertical lines) for this purpose. Clark uses the ordinary forms. This not only

saves the page from disfigurement, but at least for us, in fact for all who have not been trained to the German system of punctuation, it is quite sufficient.

The application of this criterion to the punctuation of Latin texts impresses me as a long step in the right direction. Incidentally, it calls the attention of the modern reader (whose ear is, for the most part, totally untrained) to one of the most important aspects of Latin prose style. This, however, is only incidental. The real reason is that the *cursus* is by its very nature, by the mere fact of its existence, the herald of a pause. If, therefore, we punctuate accordingly, we are actually marking the rhetorical pauses observed by the author himself in the reading of his own sentences.

Theoretically, of course, a uniform system of punctuation the world over would seem to be a most desirable thing, a matter to be urged by the advocates of phonetic spelling and of similar labor-saving devices. The Germans, for example, as against the rest of the world, are in the habit of pointing off dependent clauses (relative, conditional, etc.) even in cases where no actual pause exists. How puzzling this can be to the average American boy is well-known to any classical instructor who in making examination papers has drawn his test passages from a German edition without modifying the punctuation in accordance with our system. Experience, however, has demonstrated that the punctuation of prose in all times and tongues cannot be reduced to a common denominator. It varies with the average type of sentence to be considered, and the average type of sentence is affected by period as well as by nationality. It varies with the tendencies by which it is affected and the determinant of variation is rhetoric. More than one striking illustration is furnished by the long history of our own language and literature. To cite a single case, those who are familiar with the prose of Robert Greene have discovered for themselves that it loses not a little of its distinctive quality, indeed, that it often becomes awkward and even unintelligible, if punctuated in accordance with modern standards. Uncertain and arbitrary as it often is, the usage of the Elizabethan printers is to be preferred because it interferes less with the peculiar rhetoric and sentence-construction so characteristic of the Euphuistic style.

In the case of a Latin author, notably in the case of Ammianus as he now lies before us, we are not obliged to consider the vagaries of printers nor the carelessness of authors themselves. We can appeal to a test which, so far as it goes, is absolutely certain. Let us take as an illustration XIV, I, 2, which runs as follows:

cuus acerbitati uxor graue accésserat incentiuum, germanitate Augusti túrgida supra módu, quam Anniballiano regi fratris filio antehac Constantinus iúnxerat páter, Megaera quaédam mortális, inflammatrix saeuientis adsídua, humani cruoris auida

nihil mītiūs quam marītus. qui paulatim eruditiores facti processu tēporis ad nocēdum, per clandestinos uersútosque rumigérulos, conpertis leuiter addere quaedam male suétos, falsa et placentia sibi discētes, adfectati regni uel artium nefandarum calumnias insóntibus adfigébant.

The student who reads this passage, and in fact any passage of Ammianus, with an attempt to reproduce the value of the *cursus*, and to observe the pauses by which it is marked, will discover for himself that these strange semi-amorphous sentences, with their long series of bewildering dependent clauses clogged with adjectives, weighted with ablative absolutes, tangled with present participles, and the like, have suddenly become not only more intelligible but more musical and impressive. He has begun to understand the historian's rhetoric, to feel the effect of his stylistic devices, to realize their purpose and to estimate their value. In short, he has taken a step towards repeating in his own consciousness the impressions of those who listened to these sentences as they fell from the author's own lips. This is as it should be. Latin prose was addressed to the ear, not to the eye. We shall never discover its secrets unless we keep this rule constantly in mind. In fact, just at this time it is important to remember that the ear is the final, the indispensable test of any prose. Thanks to the printing press, a large share of our modern authors seem to have forgotten that in the artistic sense language, unlike children, is meant to be 'heard, not seen'.

But apart from its merit and usefulness, this edition is interesting as a sign of the times. It was only yesterday that we who dwell beyond the Ocean Stream were practically debarred from critical work of this sort, merely through distance from the necessary sources. Rapid transit, however, scores its victories in the Republic of Letters as well as in the world at large. This critical text is by an American editor, his coadjutor is a German scholar, and the work is being done under the auspices of the Berlin Academy. As such, it is the worthy beginning of a new and, we trust, a long and brilliant era in the tradition of classical culture and classical scholarship.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LXV (1910).

Pp. 1-21. Weitere Bemerkungen zu den attischen Rechnungs- und Uebergabeurkunden. W. Bannier. Supplementary notes to two earlier articles, LXI 202-231 and LXIII 423-444. The chief point brought out here is the lack of uniformity in the grouping of these records.

Pp. 22-87. Tibulls erste Elegie. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniss der Tibullischen Kunst. F. Jacoby. Conclusion of an article begun in Vol. LXIV 601-632. The writer argues, and afterwards assumes, that the first elegy of Tibullus is later than the first book of Propertius. He finds in it two distinct poems, the first bucolic (lines 1-50 and 75-78) derived from Horace, Epod. II, the second erotic (lines 53-74) derived from Propertius, I 6, I 17, I 19. The second is a "Cento aus Properz und Komödie", and a rather poor cento at that. Indeed, Tibullus was merely a dilettante who derived most of his erotic material from Propertius. He was not fitted either by nature or by experience to treat of such subjects. To be sure, Quintilian and Ovid have a rather high opinion of his elegies, but their authority need no longer impose on us. They are "an sich und für uns nicht kompetent".

Pp. 88-120. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. Th. Stangl. I. Notes referring to the Pro Flacco, the Cum populo gratias egit, and the Pro Plancio.

Pp. 121-129. Apollodoros περί γῆς? Ulrich Hoefer. A refutation of B. Niese's conjecture (Hermes, XLIV 161 ff.) that the Periegesis of Skymnos was derived from Apollodoros.

Pp. 130-148. Zur Schlachtordnung der Manipulare. Th. Steinwender.

Pp. 149-155. Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht. A. Brinkmann. Description of a number of tablets which served as school-books in Graeco-Roman Egypt, in the third century A. D. They have been published by Kenyon, J. H. S., XXIX 29 ff. One contains an exercise in "declinatio per casus" by a method which probably goes back to the early days of the Empire.

Miszellen.—Pp. 156-7. Th. Gomperz. Zu Kallimachos. In Epig. 54, 3 read: γινώσκεις. ἦν δ' αὖ σε λάβῃ <ποτέ> καὶ μιν ἀπαιτῆς. Or instead of <ποτέ> read <πάλι> and call πάλι καὶ hyperbaton for καὶ πάλι, 'und von neuem'.—Pp. 157-60. W. Crönert. Die

beiden ältesten griechischen Briefe. A study of two short letters of the fourth century B. C., one found at Athens, in 1888, the other in Olbia.

Pp. 161-168. Didaskalika. J. H. Lipsius. A study of the old question whether the poet himself or the didaskalos who trained the chorus for him was officially recognized as victor. E. Capps (A. J. P. XXVIII 179 ff.) held the former view; Lipsius here supports the latter.

Pp. 169-174. Commentatiuncula quinta ad Libanii ed. Foersterianam. H. van Herwerden.

Pp. 175-199. Zu Hierokles dem Neuplatoniker. A. Elter. The work of Hierokles consisted of seven λόγοι and an introduction. It was probably composed about 415 A. D. A study of the methods of Photius, the chief authority on the subject.

Pp. 200-232. Minos. E. Bethe. Minos was originally the god of the Kefti who occupied Crete in the 15th century B. C. About 1400 B. C. the palaces of Knosos and Phaistos were destroyed, and the Kefti were dispersed. Traces of their later influence may be seen in various cities named Minoa, in Sicily, in Greece, and in Phoenicia. Minos was a bull-god. The conquest of the Cretan Bull by Herakles perhaps means the conquest of the Kefti by the Cretan Dorians. The stories which connect the name of Minos with Attica and Megara are based upon the struggle of two early races for the possession of Attica.

Pp. 233-248. De Manilio et Tiberio Caesare. E. Bickel. The Caesar to whom the poem was addressed was Tiberius.

Pp. 249-269. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. III. Th. Stangl. Notes referring to the Pro Plancio, the Pro Milone, and the Pro Sestio.

Pp. 270-305 and 359-419. Ueber die Form der Darstellung in Livius Geschichtswerk. K. Witte. A long study of the manner in which Livy has embellished his history by working out special events and situations in detail. Pp. 381-397 set forth his regular procedure in describing the course of a battle. Various passages in Bks. 30-45 and 21-22—among them, the account of Hannibal's crossing of the Alps—are here compared with the corresponding passages of Polybius.

Miszellen.—Pp. 306-308. W. Crönert. Zu Kallimachos. In 54. 3 read γιγνώσκειν. ἦν δ' ἄρα λάθῃ καὶ μι<σθό>ν ἀπαιτῆς.—Pp. 308-309. A. Kretschmar. Quaestio comica. Wilamowitz has pronounced that a certain Greek fragment, Oxyr. Pap., VI 855, p. 150, cannot belong to Menander, because it shows the article in the last foot of the verse. Here Kretschmar cites five cases of this particular usage from the fragments of Menander.—Pp. 309-310. S. Sudhaus. Aristophanes Acharner 490-498. In 494 read ἀνθρώπου τὸ πρᾶγμα· εἰς νυν.—Pp. 310-313. S. Sudhaus. Zu

Diogenes von Oinoanda. The passage in which Diogenes makes Aristotle a skeptic may be based upon the misinterpretation of the abbreviation of a proper name. The proper name intended would be Ἀρκεσίλας.—Pp. 313-316. R. Philippson. Zu Philodem *περὶ σημειώσεων*.—Pp. 316-317. Karl Meiser. Zu Tacitus, *dialogus* c. 37. For "ut *secura* velint" read "ut *securam curam* velint".—Pp. 317-318. Th. Birt. Zur Phylenordnung Alexandrias. This must have been one of the earliest measures of Nero's reign, in November or December of the year 54.—P. 318. G. Mercati. Quando mori G. Lascaris. The precise date, December 7, 1534, is given by Cod. Vat. Gr. 2240.—Pp. 319-320. A. Brinkmann. Textual notes on the Ninos romance published by Wilcken, *Hermes*, XXVIII 161 ff.

Pp. 321-330. Zu dem neugefundenen arkadischen Synoikievertrag. F. Solmsen. (1) Ἐπὶ Χαιριάδαι means "in the time of Chairiadas". Chairiadas is not the eponymos of the current year, but of a somewhat earlier year. (2) Because of its use of η for α before vowels Solmsen would put the inscription well into the third century B. C. (3) The proper name Εὐαίμνιοι may be derived from the substantive *αἶμος, a cognate of the German 'Seele', Goth. 'saiwala', O. H. G. 'sēula, sēla'.

Pp. 331-338. Appunti sul palinsesto Vat. gr. 1456. G. Mercati. Notes on the only manuscript which has transmitted the original text of the Onomasticon of Eusebius. The other manuscripts are all mere copies of this one. The writer is inclined to believe, with Batiffol, that it was written in Southern Italy. He reports a long lacuna in the middle of the manuscript, and suggests that the next editor should examine carefully Bodl. Misc. 211.

Pp. 339-344. Die Listen griechischer Profanschriftsteller. Hugo Rabe. The text of 'Tabula C' from a Bodleian MS, Barocc. 125. It is here compared with Vat. 1456 and Bodl. Misc. 211.

Pp. 345-351. Nachträgliches zu Vergils Catalepton. Th. Birt. In IX 35 'raptus' means rape or ravishment, not necessarily a carrying away. The 'hirnea' of XII suggests that Atilius was a potter. The mention of the 'compitalia' in XIII 27 suggests that the poem was written before 44 B. C., probably before 46 B. C. Other notes on II b, III a 1, VII, XI 4, IX 31.

Pp. 352-358. Das Schlachtfeld am Trasimenersee. F. Reuss. A criticism of Kromayer's recent theory as to the scene of the battle.

Pp. 420-440. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. IV. Th. Stangl. Notes referring to the In Vatinius, the Pro Milone, the Pro Archia, the Pro Sulla.

Pp. 441-460. Zwei Bemerkungen zur Technik der Komödie. W. Süß. (1) A comparison of the prologue of the Roman

Comedy with the prooimion of the rhetoricians and with the parabasis of the Attic Comedy. (2) A study of the close of the comedy, both Roman and Greek.

Pp. 461-471. *Variae lectiones*. W. Crönert. (1) A defense of the verb *μνήσκειται* in Anacreon, 90 B. (2) Support of Blass's suggestion, *ἐσαΐειν* = 'sentire', in Hippocrates, *De Morbis*, IV. (3) In Lucian's *Podagra*, 8, read: *εἰς φῶς ἀνῆκε νηλὲς ἀνθρώποις βλάβος*. (4) The expression 'psolo copumai', Lucilius, 304 M., is to be explained by a vulgar Greek verb lately supplied by the London papyri, *ψωλοκοπῶ* = *ἐνοχλῶ τὴν ψωλήν*.

Miszellen.—P. 472. L. Radermacher. Zu Platons *Menon*. In 91 C for *συγγενῶν* read *σύ γε νῶν*.—Pp. 472-473. L. Radermacher. *Metrische Inschrift*. Note on a Doric inscription, apparently of the sixth century B. C. The proper name *Εὐμάρες* (= nom.) stands at the beginning of the hexameter by a special metrical license.—Pp. 473-474. A. Körte. Zu dem Berliner metrischen Papyrus.—Pp. 474-475. Th. Birt. *Lares semitales*. These are referred to in Virgil, *Catal.* X. 20.—Pp. 475-480. R. Sabbadini. Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des *Codex Medicus* (M) des Vergilius. About 1470 the *Codex Medicus* was taken from the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio to the church of St. Paul at Rome. In the years 1500-1507 it was in the Vatican. It was taken to the Vatican later than 1484, and disappeared from that library before 1521. It seems to have been stolen from the Vatican, and for some time carefully concealed.

Pp. 481-503. *Zur lateinischen Anthologie*. A. Riese. (1) Supplementary notes to the author's edition of the *Anthology* (1894, 1906). (2) The text of the poems of Isidorus of Sevilla, with critical apparatus and notes. The poems are modeled on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* of Martial.

Pp. 504-514. *Aus Sopatros Μεταποιήσεις*. S. Glöckner. Text and textual notes.

Pp. 515-538. *Zum Aufbau der Aristophanischen Lieder*. S. Sudhaus. The writer finds in Aristophanes the same symmetrical structure as he recently set forth in his 'Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica'. He analyzes the *parodos* of the *Lysistrata*, and examines various other compositions, *proodic*, *epodic*, *palinodic*, and *mesodic*. Reverting to Plautus, he analyzes the *canticum* of the *Captivi*, 516-540, and applies his theory to the improvement of the text of 502 and the punctuation of 510. In 502 'lassum' is an interpolation; in 510 'hic' goes with what precedes, not with what follows.

Pp. 539-577. *De Menandri codice Cairensi*. Ch. Jensen. Report of a recent examination of these fragments: (1) *Ad Disceptantes*; (2) *Ad Samiam*; (3) *Ad Circumtonsam*; (4) *Ad Heroem*.

Pp. 578-605. Die Nomenklatur der materfamilias vor dem Jahre 527/227. E. Bickel. A study suggested by an archaic inscription, CIL. XIV 4270, in which the wife bears the husband's name, 'Poublilia Turpilia'. The inscription belongs to the middle of the sixth century, and Etruscan influence has been suggested.

Pp. 606-616. 'Ὀδοιπορία ἀπὸ 'Εδέμ τοῦ παραδείσου ἄχρι τῶν Ῥωμαίων (Zur 'Expositio totius mundi et gentium', Geogr. lat. min., ed. Riese, 1878, p. 104 sq.). A. Klotz.

Pp. 617-626. Die Protheorie zur Biographie eines Neuplatonikers. A. Brinkmann.

Pp. 627-634. Firmiciana. F. Skutsch. A comparison of the language of Firmicus with that of Manilius.

Miszellen.—Pp. 635-636. Ch. Jensen. Zu Menanders Epitrepontes (v. 432-456).—Pp. 636-637. W. Crönert. Ein Epigramm aus Astypalaia.—Pp. 637-639. E. Lattes. Ancora dei numerali e dei nomi di mese etruschi (cf. Rh. Mus. 1902, LVII 318-320). The strongest argument for Etr. 'ci' = 'three' is based on the mistaken reading of an inscription. More likely 'ci' meant 'five'. The Etruscan name for 'October' was 'utofer', or 'ut(t)ofer'.—Pp. 639-640. A. Klotz. Ein Luciliuszitat. On Ter. Eun. 491 Donatus remarks: "antiquum verbum est 'cibum petere e flamma'". This refers to Lucilius, 659 Marx: 'mordicus petere e flamma expediat, e caeno cibum'.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXIX (1910).

Janvier.

Paul Meyer. Les Enfances Gauvain: Fragments d'un poème perdu. 32 pages. Two leaves (one of them double) of a thirteenth century manuscript recently discovered in the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève at Paris contain portions of an otherwise unknown French epic belonging to the Arthurian Cycle. There is a lengthy discussion of its relation to other epics, as well as a critical edition of the fragmentary text.

Mario Roques. Fragments d'un ms. du Roman de Renart (Branches I et VII). 11 pages. Three fragments of a thirteenth century manuscript of the Roman de Renart were recovered from the binding of a Latin manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The text gives indication of a complicated scribal tradition.

Paul Meyer. *Prière en Quatrains à la Vierge: Sermons* (Ms. B. N. fr. 24838). 10 pages. The text here published is intercalated in a volume of sermons by Maurice de Sully. This is one of a large number of similar poems.

Arthur Långfors. *La Vie de Sainte Catherine par le peintre Estienne Lanquelier* (Bibl. Nat., lat. 1379). 7 pages. An illuminator of manuscripts has here turned poet, and has inserted the text here published in a Book of Hours copied in the fifteenth century.

Hermann Suchier. *La Fille sans Mains, II.* 16 pages. A Latin prose tale concerning a King of France and his daughter who fled from home and married one of her father's vassals. The orthography, forms of expression and style of the text published are all rather curious.

Mélanges. Amos Parducci et P. Meyer, *Fragment d'un ancien Chansonnier Provençal* (Bibliothèque Classense de Ravenne, No. 165). T. Atkinson Jenkins, Melite. D. S. Blondheim, Anc. franç. moisseron. A.-T. Baker, Anc. franç. escomos, escoymous. P. M., Martin-baton. Gustave Cohen, *Notes sur le mystère de Saint-Quentin.* E. Philipot, *Les "Scieurs d'ais"*. A. Thomas, *Le Père Menfouté et la "Mort de Roland"*.

Comptes rendus. Jessie L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Perceval: Studies upon its Origin, Development and Position in the Arthurian Cycle*, Vol. II (G. Huet). J. Anglade, *Le Troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux* (P. M.). D. H. Carnahan, *Jean d'Abondance: A Study of his Life and Three of his Works* (P. M.). Géraud Lavergne, *Le Parler bourbonnais aux XIV^e et XV^e Siècles: Etude philologique de textes inédits* (A. Thomas). Arsène Darmesteter, *Les Gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible, accompagnées de notes par Louis Brandin et précédées d'une introduction par Julien Weill* (A. Thomas). Wendelin Foerster, *Kristian von Troyes Erec und Enide, zweite Auflage* (A. Thomas). Denis Roche, *Contes limousins recueillis dans l'Arrondissement de Rochechouart: Texte patois et texte français* (A. Thomas). Dante, *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, edited and translated by Charles Lancelot Shadwell (Paget Toynbee).

Périodiques. *Revue des langues romanes*, LII (P. M.). *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII. 1 (Mario Roques). *Romanische Forschungen*, XIX. 1-3 (Mario Roques). *Revue de Philologie française et provençale*, XXII (P. M.). *Annales du Midi*, XXI (A. Th.). *Revista Lusitana*, IX-XI (P. M.). *Reale Istituto lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti*, série II, t. XLII. *Fünfzehnter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig* (M. Roques).

Avril-Juillet.

D. S. Blondheim. *Contribution à la Lexicographie française*

d'après des Sources rabbiniques. 55 pages. Various scholars have investigated the French language used by the Jews of Mediaeval France, and the results of their studies have been of great use to etymologists. The present monograph, a doctor's dissertation of the Johns Hopkins University, is based largely on an unpublished twelfth century Jewish ritual which has been preserved in two manuscripts now in New York and Oxford. Other Hebrew manuscripts in various European libraries have also been drawn on occasionally, and the relations existing between the Jews of France and those of Spain in the Middle Ages are likewise touched upon.

Antoine Thomas. Notes étymologiques et lexicographiques : Nouvelle série. 84 pages. The present article consists of some sixty-seven headings under which a large number of French words, both literary and dialectic, are studied in reference to their etymologies. An extensive index arranged by languages facilitates reference to any given form which has been cited in the text.

P. Meyer. Le Salut Notre Dame : La Lettre de Prêtre Jean (fragment appartenant à la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève). 9 pages. The short texts here published formed part of a thirteenth century manuscript copied to the north of Paris. Two lists of manuscripts are included in this article.

Gertrude Schoepperle. The Love-Potion in Tristan and Isolt. 20 pages. The period of the efficacy of the love-potion in this famous story was variously stated by Mediaeval authors, and the present study is an attempt to trace the development of the conception. In even the earliest extant versions the redactors have worked the original Celtic idea over so thoroughly with moral intent that it has become of a piece with themselves,—twelfth century, French, and Christian through and through.

C. Brunel. Randon, Protecteur des Troubadours. 8 pages. The history of a noble family of the twelfth century shows that one of its members gave special protection to a number of Provençal troubadours.

Giulio Bertoni. Note e Correzioni all' antico testo piemontese dei "Parlamenti ed Epistole". 10 pages. A diplomatic reproduction of this thirteenth century text is given, accompanied by a critical study of its linguistic characteristics.

Margaret H. Jackson. Antonio Pucci's Poems in the Codice Kirkupiano of Wellesley College. 9 pages. This manuscript has belonged in recent years successively to Mr. Kirkup, an English artist living in Florence, Mr. Wild, Mr. Plimpton, and has at length found a resting-place in the Library of Wellesley College. It is contemporaneous with Antonio Pucci, and contains the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio in addition to the former's poems.

Arthur Piaget. *Ballades de Guillebert de Lannoy et de Jean de Werchin*. 45 pages. A manuscript of the Musée Condé at Chantilly contains a number of French ballads of the beginning of the fifteenth century, some of which were composed in his youth by the celebrated traveler and diplomat Guillebert de Lannoy. The poems contain a discussion of the problems usual to the Court of Love of their day. Some forty-six ballads are here published.

Mélanges. F. Rechnitz, *Sur le vers 213 de la Vie de Saint Alexis*. Ch. Bémont, *Wace et la Bataille de Hastings*. A. Thomas, *Le Dauphin Louis, fils de Charles VI, amateur du théâtre*. E. Picot, *Le Poète Jehan Drouyn*.

Comptes Rendus. Myrrha Borodine, *La femme et l'amour au XII^e siècle d'après les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes* (Mario Roques). Mary Rh. Williams, *Essai sur la composition du roman gallois de Peredur* (Mario Roques). Eduard Wechsler, *Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs* (Ferdinand Lot). Lage F. W. Staël von Holstein, *Le Roman d'Athis et Prophilias: Etude littéraire sur ses deux versions* (G. Huet). W. Meyer-Lübke, *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache, I. Laut- und Flexionslehre* (A. Thomas). G. Millardet, *Recueil de textes des anciens dialectes landais* (A. Thomas). Mathias Friedwagner, *La Vengeance Raguidel, altfranzösischer Abenteuerroman* (Gaston Raynaud).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII. 2-6 (Mario Roques). *Buletinul Societății Filologice*, II (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Obituary notices of André Devaux, Henry d'Arbois de Jubainville, Jean Mongin, Adolf Tobler and Edvard Lidforss. Adjutor Rivard has published an etymological note on the word *Esterlet* in Canadian French.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 25 titles. R. Miquel y Planas has begun the publication of a *Nova Bibliotheca Catalana: Novelari catalan de les segles XIV a XVIII* (Four numbers have already appeared). *Le livre du Chastel de Labour*, par Jean Bruyant: A Description of an Illuminated Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century, belonging to George C. Thomas, Philadelphia, with a short account and synopsis of the poem. Fr. Bliss Luquiens, *An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology*. Florence Nightingale Jones, *Boccaccio and his Imitators in German, English, French, Spanish and Italian Literature: The Decameron* ("constitue un utile instrument de recherches"). N. I. Apostolescu, *L'ancienne versification roumaine (XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles)*. A. Wallensköld, *La construction du complément des comparatifs et des expressions comparatives dans les langues romanes*. A. Terracher, *Aulica, fr. ouche*. Edmund Stengel, *Huon's aus Auvergne Höllenfahrt, nach der*

Berliner und Paduaner Hs. Enrico Carrara, *La poesia pastorale* (Storia dei generi letterari italiani). Enrico Sannia, *Il comico, l'umorismo e la satira nella Divina Commedia*.

Octobre.

C. Salvioni. *Miscellanea Etimologica e Lessicale*. 43 pages. Seventy-five words belonging to the Italian literary language and especially to the dialects are investigated etymologically.

E. Philpon. *Les Parlers du Duché de Bourgogne aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*. 56 pages. Many years ago Fallot divided the dialects of North France into three groups, of which the Burgundian was the typical form of one. Later investigators made a further division of the Burgundian group by leaving out the Western dialects. Now, however, a still further distinction is made according to which the Burgundian dialect is considered to be independent of the Lorraine and Champagne dialects as well. Numerous linguistic documents are edited from the originals in the archives, after which the linguistic characteristics of these texts are investigated with considerable minuteness.

Paul Meyer. *Notice du Ms. Egerton 745 du Musée britannique* (Vies de Saint Eustache, en vers, des saints Denis, Martin de Vertou, Gildas, Édouard, Barlaam et Josaphat, en prose, le Pseudo-Caton de Jean de Chatelet, etc.). 38 pages. The manuscript here described in detail has many points of unusual interest. It can be definitely traced from owner to owner for some time before it entered the British Museum; it is an unusually beautiful manuscript which M. Paul Meyer has studied at intervals since 1865; it was written contemporaneously by two scribes, but having later lost its first quire, the work of one scribe was intercalated in the midst of the other's work when it was rebound several centuries ago; it is beautifully illuminated and carefully written on very fine vellum; it contains various works in prose and poetry hitherto unknown to scholars. This article is to be continued in a later number.

Giulio Bertoni. *Un Frammento di una Versione perduta del Roman de Troie*. 10 pages. This is an Italian translation of Benoît de Sainte-More's *Roman de Troie* which is independent of Guido delle Colonne's Latin version. This fragment undoubtedly belonged to the middle of a large manuscript which may once have formed a part of the celebrated Este library at Ferrara. The fact that this version was written in the Venetian dialect throws an interesting sidelight on the literary relations between France and Italy in the fourteenth century.

Mélanges. L. Constans, *Miscere en ancien français*. Ch.-V. Langlois, *Anc. franç. pichar*. Edmond Faral, "*L'etre*" dans une chanson française. E. Weekley, *A propos de l'anc. franç. escomos, escoymous*. A. Thomas, *Le père de Martial d'Auvergne*.

Comptes rendus. *Mélanges offerts à M. Emile Chatelain* (Gustave Cohen). *Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à M. Maurice Wilmotte* (Mario Roques). Lorenzo Mascetta-Caracci, *Dante e il "Dedalo" Petrarquesco, con uno studio sulle malattie del Petrarca* (Henry Cochin).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIV. 1 (Mario Roques). *Romanische Forschungen*, XX. 1-3 (Mario Roques). *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XXX-XXXV (A. Jeanroy, Edm. Faral). *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, XXXIV.

Chronique. Obituary notices of Alfred Nutt, Fr. J. Furnivall, Armand d'Herbomez, Léopold Delisle, Ernest Martin, Pierre Aubry, Hermann Breymann, John E. Matzke and J.-B. Cerlogne.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 13 titles. T. Atkinson Jenkins, *Eructavit, an Old French metrical Paraphrase of Psalm XLIV*, published from all known manuscripts and attributed to Adam de Perseigne. Raymond Weeks, *Chevalerie Vivien: Facsimile Phototypes of the Sancti Bertini manuscript of the Bibliothèque municipale of Boulogne-sur-Mer, with an Introduction and Notes*. Paget Toynbee, *Dante Alighieri: His Life and Works*. John M. Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence, d'après le ms. 413 de Valenciennes*.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

BRIEF MENTION.

A candid confession is good for the soul, as the saying is, however bad it may be for the reputation, and *Brief Mention* is my confessional; and so I frankly confess that next to translations, I have learned to abominate historical novels, once the joy of my heart. For me, in my old age, historical novels fall into just two classes. Either I know the period after a fashion and then I am irritated by all manner of trifling incongruities or harassed by importunate questionings; or I don't know the period and then I am filled with disgust at my own ignorance, a disgust not unaccompanied by a vague suspicion of my authority for the time being. Correcting exercises, correcting proof breeds a deplorably criticastrous habit of mind. 'One can always give one's self up to one's impressions' said Oscar Wilde to me once with an air of profound conviction. Alas! that holds too well of the queasiness that so easily besets one as one reaches the multitudinous seas of the historical novel. In one of Ebers' performances the functionary known to Diodoros as the 'paraschist' or 'side-slitter' appears as the 'paraschit'—doubtless a typographical error in a cheap edition, but I have forgotten the story and remember only the 'paraschit'. To a native South Carolinian it was not the least of Mrs. Stowe's crimes that she called her villain 'Legree', the popular pronunciation of Legaré, a name made illustrious by a famous jurist. To the ear of a native Athenian it would have been worse than a crime to call a slave, however honest, by the name of 'Antiphon', as happened the other day in a novel written 'out of an intimate knowledge and passionate love of things Greek'. The Antiphons were all gentlemen from Antiphon of Rhamnus down to the Antiphos of Plautus and Terence. Were there no slave names in Attica? One invokes Nemesis, the goddess of Rhamnus, and cries with Dionysos in the play, *ποῦ Ζαῖθίαις*; In the same book there is a pretty scene in which a boy hero buries his hand in the pink blossoms of the almond tree, which flourishes for most of us only in the Authorized Version of Ecclesiastes, but we are in the month of April and the almond tree must have been long out of bloom according to Pliny. The trip from Athens to Megara is a day's journey. The distance in miles doesn't matter. Baedeker, practical German that he is, deals with hours not miles, and on my way from the Piraeus to Athens I had to fall back on the forty stades of Thukydides. But in the book I am thinking of 'Hoc iter ignavi divisimus' and the journey was broken at Eleusis. From Athens to Eleusis is two hours and a half by

carriage. 'Good walkers require four hours' says Baedeker, and yet our travellers start at sunrise and do not reach Eleusis until the cool of the evening—'weary with the first day's journeying', this strapping Spartan woman and this lively Athenian boy, who afterward leaps the whole way from Eleusis to Megara.

When we reach Nemea we are informed à propos of the Nemean games that 'gentle Pindar'—who is one of the characters of the book—'was as yet silent; only his heart within him was lifting and pulsing songs yet to be'. I have resented the comparison of Pindar to a mastodon (A. J. P. XXVI 115), but I should never have thought of him as a tame cat, and in 493 he must have been articulate, for he was only twenty when he indited the famous Tenth Pythian for Hippokleas of Thessaly. And indeed, further on, we are told that six years before the youthful hero was able 'to sing whole passages of Homer and almost all the odes that Pindar had as yet composed'—a slight inconsistency, which would not disturb the normal reader. It is an old observation that no department of literature is so full of chronological misstatements as memoirs, and yet memoirs are written or are supposed to be written out of intimate knowledge. I am making slow progress with the book, as slow as the hero and his mother made towards Eleusis, but I came very near refusing to take the trip at all because I was confronted at the outset by the improbable combination of an Athenian husband and a Spartan wife, the same combination one finds in other historical novels. True, the author is well aware of the unnaturalness of the whole thing, but the machinery by which the marriage is brought about does not work very well, and the details are not very satisfactory. True, there is one historical Athenian on record who buried a Lakonian wife, but that was after Eukleides, and if one must have such a union why not take Alkibiades and Timaea, who were husband and wife 'in the sight of God'—a sentimental phrase which means 'by the instigation of the devil'? True, there was scant ceremony about a Spartan marriage, no wedding that could be called a wedding, but our Athenian bridegroom did not conform to the Spartan usage, as laid down in the books, and simply repeated the performance of Theseus, but more effectively. One loses one's self in imagining the trouble our Spartan *φανομηρίς* had with the 'Saintes Nitouches' of Athens and the trouble the young father would have had when he came to register the boy in the *ληξιαρχικόν*. Fortunately the father died before the time came, and perhaps after all the Athenians were not so particular before the revision of Perikles. The boy went with his mother when she returned to Sparta and in a few days he learned to swear like the Spartans and the *μὰ τὸ θεῷ* of the Athenian women 'who', we are told 'talked that

half obsolete dialect which the men of Athens scarcely understood', became the *μὰ τὸ σιῶ* of the Spartan lads. But the theme is as inexhaustible as are the merits and demerits of translations, and this is *Brief Mention*.

Mr. PEARSON'S *Phoenissae* (Cambridge University) would have been noticed at some length long ago, if the editor had not diverted me from my purpose by bringing out HEADLAM'S *Agamemnon* and now that I despair of doing exact justice to the work of that remarkable scholar, I come back to Mr. PEARSON for a few inconsequential remarks. In his Introduction to the play, Mr. PEARSON quotes a marginal note of Macaulay's in which he recorded the confession: 'I can hardly account for the contempt which at school or college I felt for Euripides. I own that I like him now better than Sophocles'. 'It is a common experience', adds Mr. PEARSON, and he might have adduced the example of Wilamowitz, who tells us in a footnote to his edition of *Hercules Furens* (v. 637) how he talked to Jakob Bernays about Euripides in the bejaune style that Schlegel had brought into vogue, and how Bernays took down a text of the poet and read the beginning of the ode saying: 'Wait until you get older and you will see what that means'. That was in 1867. In 1867 Bernays, only a few years my senior, could not be called an old man, but he had reached the age when one begins to sigh for youth, the age when the Euripidean 'Qu'on est bien à vingt ans' begins to appeal to a man.¹ In any case it was a good selection to shew the charm of Euripides the Human, and it evidently impressed the future author of the *Analecta Euripidea*, the future *Sospitator Euripidis*. The personality of Bernays may have had something to do with it. In 1852-3 when I was at Bonn, I followed Bernays's lectures on Thukydides' speeches and Aristotle's Poetics, and, though he was in the beginning of his career as a teacher, he influenced me more profoundly than did some of my older and more distinguished professors. 'Though?' Perhaps I should have said, 'because'. The young teacher often produces by the edge of his own enthusiasm an effect which the weight of the senior's accumulated learning fails to make. I never think of Bernays without gratitude because it was he who led me into the study that resulted in my doctoral dissertation, which is an *aureum milliarium* in a student's life, in fact, the culmination of many careers. But in my talks with Bernays we never chanced upon Euripides, and for many years I was under the domination of Schlegel, and followed the trend of

¹ ἄ νεότας μοι φίλον· ἄχθος δὲ τὸ γῆρας αἰεὶ | βαρύτερον Αἰτνας σκοπέλων ἐπὶ
κρατὶ κεῖται, | βλεφάρων σκοτεινὸν φάος ἐπικαλύψαν. | μή μοι μήτ' Ἀσκήτιδος | τυ-
ραννίδος δόλος εἴη, | μὴ χρυσοῦ δώματα πλήρη | τᾶς ἥβας ἀντιλαβεῖν, | ἃ καλλίστα
μὲν ἐν δόλῳ, | καλλίστα δ' ἐν πενίᾳ.

aesthetic criticism that swayed the Germany of my time. The average Teutonic Hellenist of that day was a 'Euripidesfresser' as Menzel was a 'Franzosenfresser' and it is not surprising that a youthful Teutonomanic should have been caught by what was really a national movement. 'Quo semel est imbuta recens', and for the twenty years of my service at the University of Virginia, Euripides was relegated to the category of extra-reading. But while I never went so far in my antagonism to Euripides as did Jebb (A. J. P. XXVIII 485) the experience of life has never brought me quite so far as it brought Macaulay; and the *Phoenissae* so long the butt of adverse criticism is not the play I should select as an introduction to the study of the great poet, whom it is safe enough to admire now.

Περιπαθεῖς ἄγαν αἱ Φοίνισσαι τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, says the hypothesis and we cannot afford to thrust aside these old criticisms which a young scholar has recently done well to collect for the benefit of those who are apt to set up their own judgment against the traditional wisdom of antiquity. περιπαθεῖς ἄγαν αἱ Φοίνισσαι and the accumulation of horrors is not redeemed by the multitude of wise saws which would go far to redeem anything in the eyes of the ancient commentators, who all took Aeschines' practical view of the value of poetry which Krüger made the motto of his grammar. But the fact that the play was a famous play, 'that it held the stage after Euripides' death, and that it is one of those three which continued to be played until the later Byzantine era', would of itself make the *Phoenissae* an interesting problem; and as there has been no English edition of the play since Paley's, Mr. PEARSON has done good service in bringing to bear upon the elucidation of the *Phoenissae* the equipment which he has acquired in his previous editions of Euripidean plays, which do not belong to the *non ragioniam di lor* class with which so many manufactures are to be numbered. We are not in accord on many points of nomenclature and interpretation, but what of that? What if Mr. PEARSON calls the plural for the singular as others use an 'allusive' plural? 'Elusive' would be a better word, to judge by a recent monograph on the subject, but neither 'allusive' nor 'elusive' puts the finger on the phenomenon. 'Monistic' might answer and one has a choice between 'centripetal', which would be 'allusive', and 'centrifugal', which would be 'elusive'. What if Mr. PEARSON emphasizes the local element of the dative as do other noted scholars whereas I have insisted on the personal element in poetry and especially in Euripides with whom the semi-personification is a mania as is shown by his use of δοῦναι, which amounts to a sentimental mannerism? 'In poetry' I have said 'the warm personal dative is to be preferred everywhere to the cold local dative'

(A. J. P. XXIII 21) and 'instead of flattening antique personification let us emboss our own' (Pindar O. 2, 90). Of course, I am a slave to my own doctrines, but why emphasize them at the expense of a commentator who has earned a right to his own judgment in such matters? Why, I took up the other day a fire-new edition of Xenophon's *Anabasis* and found a lot of things that I might construe as flat contradictions of my teachings, if I dared to suppose that the run of commentators care for the discussions contained in the *Journal*. So boys are taught to translate *οὐκ ἦγον* as if it were *οὐκ ἤγαγον* (S. C. G. 216) which can only mean that *ἦγον* is an aoristic imperfect, a subversive doctrine, according to A. J. P. XXIV 180; XXIX 304 (cf. IV 160); they are taught that *πρίν* with infinitive = *πρίν* with optative (4, 5, 30) is a remarkable irregularity (A. J. P. II 476) and that there is no difference between *εἰ* with the future indicative and *εἰάν* with the subjunctive in a passage (3, 1, 13) which I might have cited thirty-five years ago to show the characteristic difference between the two constructions. The revolt against the dread alternative is followed by a sober calculation of chances—the every-day conditional. Now if these things are done in the dry tree of the *Anabasis*, which has been ground to sawdust by Joost, what might not be done in the green tree of Euripidean poetry? But I forbear.

Daos by the author of the treatise on Theocritus of which *Brief Mention* was made more than ten years ago (A. J. P. XXI 350) is just one of those books that I should like to condense for the benefit of those who have not the time to read a volume of nearly seven hundred pages on the New Comedy. (*Daos, Tableau de la Comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle*. Paris, A. Fontemoing) for M. LEGRAND belongs to the new generation of French scholars who combine a knowledge of the results of Transrhenan learning with the native grace which outsiders must be content to envy, so that the toil is beguiled by the pleasure. Unfortunately in the condensation the charm would be lost. Of course, in this work much is said about the New Menander, which, to be frank, was a prodigious disappointment to those who had not been braced by previous undceptions. 'If we only had this and if we only had that', and when we get this and when we get that, we find that the best wine has lain in our bins all the while. I am contemporary with most of those disillusionments. The growl over Fronto (A. J. P. XXV 358) had not ceased its reverberation in the time of my apprenticeship (1850-1853). Every lecturer on Roman literature at that day fastened his hook in the prostrate form of the good old African and Naber's edition is a 'ducitur unco'. I think over all the great discoveries—Hypereides, intimately associated with my favorite teacher Schneidewin, Aristotle's Constitution

of Athens, Herondas, Bakchylides, Timotheos, the various lyric fragments—all welcome, all illuminating. It is not necessary to extol the treasures that Egypt has yielded, and yet there are moods in which one understands Mr. RIDGEWAY, whose outspokenness is delightful, when he says (*The Origin of Tragedy*, p. 148):

No matter how meritorious are the results of the labours of archaeologists and papyrographers, it must be confessed that neither the *Polity of the Athenians* nor the recently discovered work of an historian of the fourth century B. C., although valuable as historical documents, has much claim to literary merit. Bacchylides has proved very disappointing, and the recently discovered remains of Menander still more so, while the new fragments of Pindar have only furnished us with examples of his work far inferior to those great Epinician Odes that have made the Theban eagle famous through the ages. Of Herondas it may be said that if his writings were again lost, Greek literature would not be much the poorer. The verdict of men of culture, arrived at in the long lapse of time, has been profoundly just. Not only is it the truly great writers—Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Pindar, Herodotus, Thucydides—that have come down to us, but the best productions of these authors, as is clearly seen in the case of the recently discovered fragments of Pindar.

But even those who stood at the birth of the New Menander were not unduly enthusiastic, and in one of the earliest appreciations which one finds in the Bodin-Mazon *Extraits d'Aristophane et de Ménandre* the estimate is remarkable for its balance in view of the newness of the discovery. In fact, for real enthusiasm we have to look to Professor SHOWERMAN'S review of Professor CAPPS' edition of *Four Plays of Menander* (Ginn), a memorable work for which all Greek scholars are duly grateful. In the wake of this achievement we shall doubtless have a number of dissertations dealing with various sides of the poet's language and art, and I myself have been guilty of suggesting a study of Menander's use of the perfect tense (A. J. P. XXIX 390). There is enough of Menander to begin the business of tabulating his usage, if it were only to prove by figures the correctness of early impressions. Wilamowitz is emphatic as to the normality of Menander's verse. Menander, he says, is as correct as Aristophanes, and what Menander is in his verse, he is elsewhere, and by his *Studies in Menander* (Bryn Mawr, The Author, \$1) Dr. F. WARREN WRIGHT has amply confirmed the impression of conventionality. The chapter of Oaths in Menander with its portentous array of literature brings us to the expected result, that 'the characters in Menander used the oaths generally used in other Greek comedies and presumably by the mass of the people', with the droll inference, 'the oaths in Menander, therefore, furnish additional evidence that his language was closely imitative of the language of the common people'. The presumption of the first sentence becomes the proof of the second. In Menander as elsewhere the oath by Zeus is the most common and the least significant. In later Greek it is often

found as one word without the compliment of a capital letter; and there is not the slightest use in trying to find out any special propriety in an oath that is as wide as heaven itself. Of course, when epithets are used, the case is different. The assignment of oaths according to the sexes is familiar from Aristophanes who makes a point of it, but the attempt to find a special propriety in every oath is doomed to failure. In the last analysis the special propriety oath is a manner of Bob Acres oath of which Aristophanes sets the pattern in the *Birds*, *μὰ παγίδας, μὰ νεφέλας, μὰ δίκτυα*; but such exactness is not compatible with the excitement of the situation that elicits the oath, to say nothing of the verse. Chaucer is careful to tell us how daintily the prioress swore, but I venture to say that the oaths in Shakespeare would defy any such analysis as Dr. WRIGHT has applied to the oaths in Menander. Neil's suggestion that the oath by Poseidon is the oath of the conservative is seductive, especially in view of the aristocratic character of names in *-ιππος*, but Dr. WRIGHT has relegated that observation to a footnote. 'Young men', he says, 'swore by Poseidon only for special reasons; but with old men the oath was almost a commonplace. Women never swore by Poseidon', but women's swearing range is limited at any rate. In reading Lucian it has seemed to me that he is more prone to special propriety oaths than native writers, but I have long since learned to distrust impressions. But comment on the details of this part of the study would carry me beyond the bounds of *Brief Mention*.

The second chapter deals with quantity by position before mutes and liquids in the iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters of Menander. The general subject has an enormous literature, but the main facts are familiar. *γμ, γν, δμ, δν* always make position; *βλ* and *γλ* regularly do, in Aristophanes always. The remaining combinations, which constitute the vast majority, have as a rule no effect upon the quantity of a preceding short syllable. When Aristophanes says *κᾶπνιον* (Vesp. 251) we know that he is jesting. This difference between Attic and Epic is very interesting to the student of Pindar because it has been shown that in the lighter logaoedic measures Pindar inclines to the Attic norm, in the graver dactylo-epitrites to the Epic norm (A. J. P. XIII 385; XXVII 381). What has become of this pretty distinction in the recent upturning of Greek metres, I prefer not to inquire (A. J. P. XXXI 126). Suffice it for the present purpose to say that Dr. WRIGHT has after detailed discussion reached the conclusion, for which Wilamowitz had prepared us, 'Menander's prosodic treatment of syllables before a mute and liquid was not a whit different from that of Aristophanes'. And the conclusion of the third chapter On the Omission of the Article shows that the faithful lover of Glykera

was faithful here also, faithful at least in human measure, and 'sparingly', probably never directly contravened the usage of prose by omitting the article for the sake of his verse. Really the normality of Menander is almost oppressive, and he ought to have lived to a good old age instead of losing his life at an early age by yielding to the 'placidi pellacia ponti'. The fourth chapter of Dr. WRIGHT's dissertation deals with Asyndeton, which Demetrius Phalereus tells us is a characteristic of Menander (A. J. P. XXIX 327). Asyndeton is so natural to us that we have to acquire the feeling for it in Greek and learn to miss the hooks and eyes of the Greek sentence. English writers are capable of reeling off yards of narrative without a conjunction. The latest fad in French literature, Marie-Claire, abounds in ἀσύνδετον and ὀρθότης, both marks to a Greek of inartificiality—real or mock. Of course, extremes meet, and the elevated style of Pindar abounds so much in asyndeton that Disson has written a special excursus on the subject, which I do not intend to do. Dr. WRIGHT's conclusion is that the poet used asyndeton so freely in order that as a playwright he might enliven his verse and make it more appropriate to the dramatic style. It is always a pleasure to have impressions confirmed, and if there is no surprise in Dr. WRIGHT's dissertation, the work was worth doing.

In the last number of the Journal Professor RAND has referred to the admirable study of the Five Ages of Hesiod, contained in the *Genethliakon* dedicated to Carl Robert on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday (Berlin, Weidmann), in which EDUARD MEYER has brought the personality of the poet of Askra much nearer to us, though, to be sure, Hesiod never dwelt apart from everyday humanity. Of especial interest to me in view of earlier studies is the footnote (p. 103) in which Professor MEYER traces the history of Hesiod's married life; how in his poverty-stricken youth he was sadly plagued by his Xanthippe, but how as he grew old and had gathered gear and his wife cared less for dress, he seems to have been on more comfortable terms with his other half, though he never shews the same resigned spirit as Sokrates, and breaks out every now and then in drastic expressions. But Sokrates never wavered in his belief in Xanthippe's fidelity, whereas I, for one, cannot suppress the suspicion of a sinister meaning in the famous line

τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἑοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν,

as well as in v. 166

οὐδὲ πατὴρ παίδεσσιν ὁμοίος οὐδέ τι παῖδες.

There may have been a 'sport' among the children of the couple in whose conjugal relations Professor MEYER has shewn and

roused such interest. And if we are to press modern biographical analogies, it was to such a 'sport' that Stesichoros owed his parentage.

There are other papers in the *Genethliakon* besides EDUARD MEYER's that deserve longer notice than can be accorded to them in *Brief Mention*. Of the *Three Chapters of Elean History* the most interesting for the student of Pindar is the third, in which BENEDICTUS NIESE maintains that there was no such independent community as Pisatis until 365 and 364 B. C. when the Arcadians cut off a part of Elis under that name and incorporated it into the Arcadian League. Busolt is right, Swoboda and Frazer wrong. There never was such a πόλις as Pisa. Pisa was originally the name of the territory in which Olympia lay and became simply the equivalent—poetical or other of Olympia. It was just a part of Elis and the later history of the district was merely projected into the earlier. A similar projection is to be found in WISSOWA's *Naeuius and the Metelli*. The familiar 'model' Saturnian 'Malum dabunt Metelli Naeui poetae' was manufactured by Caesius Bassus in the time of Nero, a droll model at best, inasmuch as it has no real fellow in our store of genuine Saturnians. The verse to which it is supposed to be a retort, 'Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules' is no Saturnian at all but simply an old-fashioned senarius, and Zumpt was right when he maintained many years ago that in the time of Naeuius the Metelli had not begun to play so conspicuous a part in the official life of Rome as the squib implies. Far different was the case two or three generations after Naeuius when there were consuls out of the Metellus family enough and to spare; when in the space of some twenty years six consulships, four censorships and five triumphs fell to the lot of six descendants of the Metelli of Naeuius' time. Indeed, it has been suggested that the saying, 'Fato Metelli', was made up by some grammarian who had nothing better to do, out of the words of Cicero who first alludes to the fatality of the Metellan consulship, but Wissowa rejects this hypothesis. It was one of those jokes that passed from mouth to mouth among the Roman populace and the response to it was fashioned by the grammarian already mentioned, and the whole thing foisted upon Naeuius and the Metelli of his time. And so one of the most famous sayings in the history of Roman literature is sent to keep company with other famous sayings, the saying of Cambronne at the battle of Waterloo and the saying attributed to the Comte d'Artois, the future Charles X, when he reëntered Paris.

Another Pindaric note, which may serve as a stopgap. I have long wanted to know who first interpreted Pindar's λουρί-φανοι Ἀθῆναι as a reference to the amethystine hues of the garland

of mountains that encompasses Athens, as I phrased it in *Hellas and Hesperia* (p. 40), and otherwise elsewhere. In an article on *Aristophanes and Nature* written à propos of Rostand's Chantecler and published in the *Revue de Paris* for October, 1910, M. PAUL GIRARD attributes the interpretation to the historian Paparrhigopoulos 'homme de grande valeur', and, like all the Greeks I have ever known, a passionate lover of his country, and then the author goes on to say that Aristophanes would have laughed at the 'patriotique contresens'. Perhaps so, but Aristophanes would have laughed also at M. GIRARD's misinterpretation of Ach. 635, where the *ἡμᾶς* does not mean the Athenians themselves as is evident from the two other passages in which Aristophanes quotes Pindar's *ἰοστέφανοι* 'Αθῆναι Eq. 1323 and 1329, nay, as is evident from the context of the passage in the Acharnians

*εἰ δέ τις ἡμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθῆνας
εὖρετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαράς.*

It is to me inconceivable that the Athenians should have sat up in ecstasy at being told that they were in the habit of wearing what M. GIRARD calls their pet flower; and if Aristophanes thought of the fragrant violets—were they our violets?—that perfumed the fields of Athmonon and furnished forth the favorite wreaths of the Athenians, the Pindaric scholar has a right to read his *ἰοστέφανοι* 'Αθῆναι by the mystic light of the Sixth Olympian—*τοῦτ' ὄνυμ' ἀθάνατον*—if not by the violet hues of the mountains that I gazed on with swelling heart fifteen years ago as I was leaving Athens doubtless forever and sailing on the watery paths that lead to Byzantium. But, if I remember aright, Ernst Curtius saw in *ἰοστέφανοι* a reference to the Ionian kinship of Athens. No interpreter possesses an achromatic lens.

Out of the mass of examples in Professor R. B. STEELE's *Conditional Sentences in Livy* (Leipzig, R. Brockhaus) I gather one or two things that I am inclined to emphasize. Nothing could prove more distinctly the perverseness of comparing the Latin present subjunctive with the Greek subjunctive in conditional relations than the extreme rarity of *si* with the present subjunctive in the protasis and the future indicative in the apodosis for which STEELE cites only four examples, all the subjunctives being translatable by the Greek optative. In like manner *ac si* with the present subjunctive corresponds to *ὥσπερ εἰ* with the optative, as I have urged before (A. J. P. XXII 65; XXV 481; XXX 11). In summing up the author remarks that in Livy 'the unreal conditions are far more numerous than the ideal, a fact incidental to the general character of the work', and thus makes a point too often overlooked by writers on statistical syntax.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle. *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*; recognovit I. Bywater; editio altera. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 8 + 48 pp. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 50 c.

Aristophanes. *The Clouds*; Prose translation, critical notes and commentary by W. J. M. Starkie. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 88 + 369 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Botsford (G. W.) *A history of the ancient world*. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 18 + 588 pp. maps, il. 8°, \$1.50 net.

Ciceronis orationes; Cum senatui gratias egit, etc.; recognovit Gullelmus Peterson. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 75 c.

— Pro Tullio, etc.; recognovit Albertus C. Clark. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 60 c.

Crittenden (A. R.) *The sentence structure of Virgil*. Ann Arbor, Mich., *University of Michigan*, 1911. 72 pp. 8°, 50 c.

Ferriman (Z. D.) *Greece and the Greeks*. New York, *Pott*, 1911. 338 pp. pls. 8°, \$3 net.

Fowler (W. W.) *The religious experience of the Roman people*. Gifford lectures. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 18 + 504 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Head (B. V.) and others. *Historia numorum; a manual of Greek numismatics*. New and enl. ed. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 31 + 966 pp. (10 pp. bibl.) il. tabs. 8°, \$12.75.

Holmes (T. R. E.) *Cæsar's conquest of Gaul*. 2d ed., rev. throughout and largely rewritten. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 39 + 872 pp. por. 12°, \$7.75.

Hunt (A. S.) *Catalogue of the Greek papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Vol. I. Literary texts No. 1-16. London, 1911. 8°, 12s. net.

Kelsey (F. W.) ed. *Latin and Greek in American Education*. New York, *Macmillan*. 10 + 396 pp. 8° (University of Michigan studies, Humanistic ser.), \$1.50 net.

Murray (G.) *The rise of the Greek epic*; 2d ed., rev. and enl. New York, *Oxford University*, 1911. 368 pp. 8°, \$1.50.

Sophocles. *Antigone*; tr. into English verse by Jos. E. Harry. Cincinnati, *R. Clarke Co.*, 1911. 60 pp. 8°, \$1 net.

Spagnolo (Baptista) [Called Mantuanus]. The eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus; ed., with introd. and notes, by Wilfred P. Mustard. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1911. 156 pp. 8°, \$1.50.

Taciti Opera omnia. Recognovit C. D. Fisher. London, 1911. 8°, 15s.

FRENCH.

Daremberg (Ch.) et Saglio. Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. T. IV, 2^e partie (R.-S.), grav., in-4°. *Hachette et Cie*. 25 fr.

Hovelacque (A.) La linguistique, histoire naturelle du langage. in-8°. *Schleicher frères*. br., 1 fr. 95; cart., 2 fr. 45.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsrg. v. Rich. Förster. gr. 8°. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*. 43. Heft. Hauck (Max). De hymnorum Orphicorum aetate. (63 S.) 1911. 2.40.

Belzner (E.) Homerische Probleme. I. Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der Odyssee als krit. Instanz. Mit e. Nachwort (Aristarchea) v. A. Roemer. (vi, 202 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 5.

Cicero. Paradoxa stoicorum. Academicorum reliquiae cum Lucullo. Timaeus. De natura deorum. De divinatione. De fato. Ed. Otto Plasberg. Fasc. II. (IV u. S. 197-399.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 8; geb. 9.

Crusius (Otto). Wie studiert man klassische Philologie? Ein Vortrag. (58 S.) 8°. München, *E. Reinhardt*, 1911. .60.

Dietrich (Rud.) Collectanea zu Artemidorus Daldianus. 8°. Rudolstadt, *Müller*. 3. 4. 5. 7. Tl. (27 S.) (Tl. 6 ist noch nicht erschienen.)

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XIX. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 4. Gross (Otto). De metonymiis sermonis latini a deorum nominibus petitis. (S. 296-410.) 1911. 3.

Ebeling (Heinr.) Schulwörterb. zu Homers Odyssee u. Ilias. 7. verb. Aufl. (iv, 263 S.) gr. 8°. Hannover, *Hahn*. 1.80.

Erbe, Das, der Alten. Schriften üb. Wesen u. Wirkg. der Antike, gesammelt u. hrsrg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. 2. u. 3. Heft. Süss (Wilh.) Aristophanes u. die Nachwelt. 1. u. 2. Aufl. (ix, 226 S.) 4; geb. 5.

Foerster (Rich.) Das Erbe der Antike. Festreden. (vii, 114 S.) Lex. 8°. Breslau, *Koebner*, 1911. 3.

Galenı Pergameni de atticissantium studiis testimonia. Collegit Herbst. (166 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 6.

Gruhn (Alb.) Der Schauplatz der Ilias u. Odyssee. Lex. 8°. Friedrichshagen-Berlin (Westend 5), *Selbstverlag*. 11. Heft. Von den Sirenen bis Ogygia. Die Inseln der Irrfahrt. (179 S.) 1911. 5.50. Heft 4, 7 u. 8 sind noch nicht erschienen.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsrg. von Iwan v. Müller. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. IV. Bd. 2. Abtlg. II. Tl. Blümner (Hugo). Die römischen Privataltertümer. (xi, 677 S. m. 86

Abbildgn.) 1911. 12; geb. in Halbfrz. n 14. VII. Bd. Christ (Wilh. v.) Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. 5. Aufl., unter Mitwirkg. v. O. Stählin bearb. v. W. Schmid. 2. Tl.: Nachklassische Periode der griech. Litteratur. I. Hälfte: Von 320 vor Christus bis 100 nach Christus. 2. Lfg. (VIII u. S. 235-506.) 1911. 4.50. VIII. Bd., 2. Abtlg., I. Hälfte. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis auf Justinian. 2. Tl.: Die röm. Litteratur bis auf Hadrian. I. Hälfte: Die augustische Zeit. 3., ganz umgearb. u. stark verm. Aufl. mit Register. (xii, 604 S.) 1911. 10; geb. in Halbfrz. n 12.

Homer's Gedichte. 2. Tl.; Die Ilias. Bearb. v. Osk. Henke. Text. 1. Bd.: Buch 1-13. 4. Aufl. (iv, 295 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. geb. in Halbleinw. 2.

Hönn (Karl). Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Viten des Hellogabalus u. des Severus Alexander. (vi, 252 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 8; geb. in Leinw. 9.

Horatius; Satiren u. Episteln. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. G. T. A. Krüger. 1. Bdchn. Satiren. 16. Aufl., besorgt v. Gust. Krüger. (xlii, 224 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. v. W. Kroll. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. Suppl.-Bd. 151. Bd. Klussmann (Rud.) Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum. Die Literatur von 1878-1896 einschliesslich umfassend. I. Bd.: Scriptores graeci. 2. Tl.: Hybrias bis Zosimus. (450 S.) 1911. 11; Einzelpr. 12.

Leyen (Frdr. v. der). Wie studiert man deutsche Philologie? (Vortrag). (24 S.) 8°. München, *E. Reinhardt*, 1911. .60.

Libanii Opera. Recensuit Rich. Foerster. Vol. VI. Declamationes XIII-XXX. (iv, 66 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 14; geb. 14.80.

Lillge (F.) Komposition u. poetische Technik der *Διομήδους Ἀριστεία*. (vi, 116 S.) 8°. Gotha, *Fr. A. Perthes*, 1911. 2.

Lodge (Gonzalez). Lexicon Plautinum. Vol. I fasc. VI. (S. 481-576.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 7.20.

Maragliannis (G.) Antiquités crétoises. II. série. Texte de G. Karo. (50 Taf. in Phototyp. m. XVII S. Text.) 25 x 33 cm. Candie (Kreta). Athen, *Eleftheroudakis & Barth*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. nn 24.

Methner (Rud.) Bedeutung u. Gebrauch des Konjunktivs in Relativsätzen u. Sätzen m. cum. (vii, 140 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1911. 3.

Ovidi Nasonis (P.) Amorum libri tres. Erklärt v. P. Brandt. (239 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1911. 7; geb. 9.

Platonis politela. Liber I. Für den Schulgeb. erklärt v. Waldem. Olsen. (iv, 78 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1911. 1.

Σοφοκλέους δράματα τὰ σωζόμενα ἐξ ἑρμηνείας καὶ διορθώσεως Πέτρου Νικ. Παπαγεωργίου. Tom. I. Ἡλέκτρα. (cccxv, 547 S.) Lex. 8°. Athen, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 10.

Sophokles' König Oidipus. Geo. Kern. 4. Aufl., bes. v. Frdr. Paetzolt. (viii, 65 u. 71 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1910. 1.50.

Trendelenburg (Adf.) Pausanias' Hellenika. Progr. (29 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1911. 1.

Untersuchungen, Philologische, hrag. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Willamowitz-Moellendorff. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 20. Heft. Malten (Ludf.) Kyrene. Sagengeschichtliche u. histor. Untersuchgn. (xiii, 222 S.) 1911. 8.

Vahlen (Johs.) Gesammelte philologische Schriften. 1. Tl. Schriften der Wiener Zeit 1858-1874. (vii, 658 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 14; geb. in Halbfz. 16.50.

Willamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Über die Wespen des Aristophanes. (I.) (S. 460-491.) (II.) (S. 504-535.) Aus: "Sitzgsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex. 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1911.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi utgivet genom Axel Kock. 28. Bandet. Ny Följa, 24. Bandet, Häftet 1. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1911.

Armstrong (Edward C.) The French Shifts in Adjective Positions and their English Equivalents. (Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott.)

Arnold (E. Vernon). Roman Stoicism. Being Lectures on the History of the Stoic Philosophy with Special Reference to the Development within the Roman Empire. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911. 10s. 6d.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἑπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος 23. Τεύχος 1 καὶ 2. Ἀθήνησιν, Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1911.

Austin (Herbert D.) The Origin and Greek Version of the Strange-Feathers Fable. Reprint from Studies in Honor of A. M. Elliott. Vol. I. Baltimore, 1911.

Behaghel (Otto). Geschichte der deutschen Sprache (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie). Herausg. von H. Paul. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1911. 6 m.

Bericht over den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie van het Jaar 1910. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1911.

Brandt (Paul). P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres. Erklärt von Paul Brandt. Leipzig, *Dieterich (Theodor Meichen)*, 1911. 9 m.

Bréal. Estudio critico por el Dr. Juan M. Dihigo. Publicado en la Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Habana, *Imprenta Avisador Comercial*, 1911.

Bruce (J. D.) The Alphabet of Tales. No. 135 (Tales of the Fetid Breath). Sonderabdruck aus dem Archiv für d. Studium der neueren Sprachen. Bd. CXXVI. Heft 1/2. 1911.

Catulli, Tibulli, Properti Carmina quae extant omnia cura Robinson Ellis, Joannis P. Postgate. Joannis S. Phillimore. Londini, *apud P. H. Lee Warner*, MDCCCXCI. £1, 1s.

Certamen Poeticum Hoeufftianum. Fanum Vacunae. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum. Accedunt quatuor carmina laudata. Amstelodami, *apud Io. Mullerum*, MCMXI.

XAPITEZ. Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911. 16m.

Christ, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. 5. Aufl. unter Mitwirkung von O. Stählin von Wilhelm Schmidt. Zweiter Teil. Die Nachklassische Periode. I. Hälfte. Zweite Lfg. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1911. 4 m. 50 pf.

Ciceros Rede für T. Annlus Milo mit dem Kommentar des Asconius und den Bobienser Scholien. Herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Wessner. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber's Verlag*, 1911. 1.60, Geb. 2. —m.

Clarke (M. G.) Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period: Girton College Studies No. 3. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Collitz (Klara Hechtenberg). Accentuation of Prefixes in English. Sonder-Abdruck, Englische Studien. 43. Band. 2. Heft.

Companion to Latin Studies (A). Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by John Edwin Sandys. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1910. 18s.

Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (The) Adapted by H. W. and F. G. Fowler from The Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1911.

Cory (Herbert E.) The Critics of Edmund Spenser. (Univ. of Cal. Publications in Mod. Philol. Vol. 2, No. 2.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Drake (A. M.) Selected and Supplementary Discoveries showing Aryo-Semitic Cognation. Denver, *The Herrick Co.* London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1911.

Eastern-Western Review. May, June, July, and August, 1911. Boston, *I. I. Timayenis*, @ 10c.

Elderkin (G. W.) Tholos and Abaton at Epidaurus. (Reprint from Am. Jour. Archaeol., Second Series, Vol. XV (1911), No. 2.)

Ellis (Robinson). The Tenth Declamation of (Pseudo-) Quintilian. A Lecture. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1911. 1s. net.

Fraccaroli (Giuseppe): Constantin Ritter. Note critiche al Persiani di Timoteo. (Estratti della Rivista di Filologia Classica. Luglio, 1910. Aprile, 1911.)

Fulda, Der Talisman. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Questions, and Vocabulary, by Otto Manthey-Zorn. 16 mo, xxiii + 239 pages, with frontispiece. Boston, *Ginn and Company*, 1911. 45 c.

Garnett (James Mercer). Biographical Sketch of Hon. Charles Fenton Mercer. Privately printed by Whittet and Shepperson. Richmond, Va. 1911.

Gudeman (A.) Grammatik. Sonderabdruck (nicht im Handel) aus Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart, *J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung*.

Hamilton (George L.) Dante in English Literature from Chaucer to Cary. (Reprinted from the Romanic Review, Vol. II, No. 2.)

Hempl (George). Early Etruscan Inscriptions. Fabretti 2343-2346. (Reprinted from the Matzke Memorial Volume.) Stanford University, *The University Press*, 1911.

Hermes. Herausg. von Friedrich Leo und Carl Robert. 46. Bd. 3. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1911.

Hoskier (H. C.) Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament, 2 vols. London, *B. Quaritch*, 1910 and 1911. 12s. net.

Johnson (A. C.) A Comparative Study in Selected Chapters in the Syntax of Isaeus, Isocrates and the Attic Psephismata preceding 300 B. C. (J. H. U. Diss.) Athens, *Printing Office "Hestia"*, 1911.

Jones (William), Algonquian (Fox). An Illustrated Sketch. Revised by Truman Michelson. Extract from Handbook of American-Indian Languages. Bulletin 40. Part 1. Bureau of American Ethnology (Boas). *Washington Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Jordan (Hermann). Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig, *Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer*, 1911. Geh. 16m., geb. 17m.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXXI. Part I. 1911. London, Macmillan & Co., \$1.

Keep (Winthrop L.) The Separation of the Attributive Adjective from its Substantive in Plautus. (Univ. of California Publications in Class. Philol., Vol. 2, No. 7.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Kirtland (J. C.) The Consequents of the Commission's Report. (Reprint from the Classical Journal, Vol. VI, No. 8, May, 1911.

Kornitzer (Alois). Lateinisches Übungsbuch für Obergymnasien. 2te Ausg. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. 2 m.

Kurrelmeyer (W.) Die Doppeldrucke von Goethes Werken. Reprinted from Modern Language Notes, May, 1911.

Lamberton (Clark D.) Themes from St. John's Gospel in Early Roman Catacomb Painting. Princeton Ph. D. Diss.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Realanstalten. Bearb. v. Christian Harder. II. Tell: Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m. 20 pf.

Latin and Greek in American Education. Edited by Francis W. Kelsey. University of Michigan Publications. Humanistic Papers. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1911.

Lowe (W. H.) Russian Roots and Compounds. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1911.

Marx (Friedrich). Naeuius. (Abdruck aus den Berichten der phil.-hist. Klasse der Königl. Sächs. Ges. der Wiss. zu Leipzig. Band LXIII. Sitzung vom 29. April 1911.)

Μελέτη (H). Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. Τεύχος 3ον, 4ον, 5ον, καὶ 6ον. Μάρτιος, Ἀπρίλιος, Μάιος, Ἰούνιος-Ἰούλιος, 1911. ἐν Ἀθήναις @ 1 ὀρ.

Memory in Art, The Training of, and the Education of the Artist by Lecoq de Boisbaudran. Transl. from the French by L. D. Luard. With an Introduction by Selwyn Image. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1911. \$2.

Merrill (William A.) Studies in the Text of Lucretius. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 2, No. 6.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Métrieque Sacrée des Grecs et des Romains. Par E. Cézard. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1911. 8 fr.

Mosiman (Eddison). Das Zungenreden geschichtlich u. psychologisch untersucht. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)*, 1911. 4 m. 50.

Muséon (Le). Études Philologiques, Historiques et Religieuses. Publié par Ph. Collinet et L. De La Vallée Poussin. Nouvelle Série. Vol. XII. No. 1. Louvain, *J.-B. Istas*, 1911.

Mustard (W. P.) The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1911. \$1.50.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Jo. Ilberg u. Bernh. Gerth. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII. u. XXVIII. Bandes 4. 5. 6. u. 7. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 1/2. Helsingfors, 1911.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray. TEAM-TEZKERE (Vol. IX). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, July 1, 1911. Double Section (\$1.25).

Papyri Graecae Berolinenses. Collegit Wilhelm Schubart. (Tabulae in usum scholarum editae sub cura Iohannis Lietzmann, II.) Bonnae, A. Marcus et E. Weber, 1911. 6m.

Paxson (Susan). Two Latin Plays. 12 mo, cloth, xii + 39 pages. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1911. 45 c.

Philologische Untersuchungen herausg. von A. Kiessling und U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 20. Heft. Kyrene. Sagengeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen von Ludolf Malten. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. 8m.

Pichon (J. E.) Leçons Pratiques de Vocabulaire, de Syntaxe et de Lecture littéraire. Freiburg (Baden), J. Bielefelds Verlag, 1911. m. 3.50.

Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. XXXIII. Part 5. London, The Offices of the Society, 1911.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904, 1905 and 1909. Division II: Ancient Architecture in Syria. By Howard Crosby Butler. Division III. Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria. By Eno Littmann, David Magie, Jr., and Duane Reed Stuart. Sedn A: Southern Syria. Part 2. Southern Haanan. Late E. J. Brill. Leyden, 1910. m. 23.50.

Rand (E. K.) Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's Works and Days. (Reprint from American Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXII, 2.

— Review of *Index Verborum Vergilianus* by Monroe Nichols Wetmore. (Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. VI, No. 3, July, 1911.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XII. Num. 2 y 3. Imprenta "Avisador Comercial", 1911.

Revue Celtique. Dirigée par J. Loth. Vol. XXXII, No. 2. Paris, Librairie Honoré Champion, 1911.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. 66. Bandes 2. u. 3. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag, 1911.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. Direttore Ettore Stampini. Anno XXXIX, Fasc. 3°. Torino, Ermanno Loescher, 1911.

Robertson (A. T.) Kurzgefasste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Deutsche Ausg. von Hermann Stock. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1911. 5 m.

Römische Komödien deutsch von C. Bardt. III. Bd. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. 5m.

Saylor (Charles H.) A Comparative Scheme of the Moods and Tenses of Cicero's Translations from the Greek. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., 1911.

Scriptor Latinus. Menstruus Commentarius. Annus VIII. Num. IX. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1911. m. 4.25 per ann.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Aristotelis De Arte Poetica Liber. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. Editio altera. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, MCMXI. 2s.

Skeat (W. W.) English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 40c.

Snedeker (Caroline D.) The Coward of Thermopylae. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co., 1911.

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 48. Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico, by John R. Swanton. Bulletin 44. Indian Languages of Mexico and Central America and their Geographical Distribution, by Cyrus Thomas and John R. Swanton. Bulletin 50. Preliminary Report of a Visit to the Navaho National Monument, Arizona, by J. W. Fewkes. Bulletin 51. Antiquities of the Mesa Verde National Park Cliff Palace, by J. W. Fewkes. *Washington Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Steele (R. B.) Case Usage in Livy. II. The Dative. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus*, 1911.

Studies in Philology. Vol. VII. Howe (George). Nature Similes in Catullus. Bain (Charles W.) On ὅπως and ὅπως ἄν. Vol. VIII. Royster (James Finch). A Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments, edited with notes and an introduction. Part II. Introduction. Chapel Hill, N. C., *The University Press*, 1911.

Ullman (B. L.) The Manuscripts of Propertius. (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. VI, No. 3.) Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1911.

Valentini (R.) Circa l'unità di tradizione nelle Antologie Valeriane. (Estr. Riv. *Classici e neolatini*, n. 1, a. VII, 1911.) Aosta, *Tip. e Leg. Giuseppe Marguerettaz*, 1911.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U. von). Über die Wespen des Aristophanes. I. II. Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Ak. d. Wissenschaften. Sitzung der phil. histor. Classe vom 20. April u. vom 4. Mai. XXI. XXIII. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1911. je 1 m.

Woolley (R. M.) The Liturgy of the Primitive Church. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1910. 5s.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen. Herausg. von H. J. Müller. 65. Jahrg. Der Neuen Folge 45. Jahrg. Juni. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Litteratur. Herausg. von Edward Schroeder und Gustav Roethe. 53. Bd. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur herausgegeben von Dr. D. Behrens. Band XXXVIII. Heft 1. u. 3. Der Abhandlungen erstes und zweites Heft. Chemnitz u. Leipzig, *Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau*, 1911.